BUDDHIST HYBRID SANSKRIT GRAMMAR AND DICTIONARY

FRANKLIN EDGERTON
Sterling Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, Yale University

VOLUME I: GRAMMAR

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS PUBLISHERS
PRIVATE LIMITED • DELHI

First Edition: New Haven, 1953

Reprint: Delhi, 1970, 1972, 1977, 1985, 1993, 1998

ISBN: 81-208-0998-x (Vol. I)
ISBN: 81-208-0997-1 (Set)

Also available at :

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

41 U.A. Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi 110 007
8 Mahalaxmi Chamber, Warden Road, Mumbai 400 026
120 Royapettah High Road, Mylapore, Chennai 600 004
Sanas Plaza, Subhash Nagar, Pune 411 002
16 St. Mark's Road, Bangalore 560 001
8 Camac Street, Calcutta 700 017
Ashok Rajpath, Patna 800 004
Chowk, Varanasi 221 001

By arrangement with Yale University Press, New Haven

PRINTED IN INDIA

BY JAINENDRA PRAKASH JAIN AT SHRI JAINENDRA PRESS,
A-45 NARAINA INDUSTRIAL, PHASE I, NEW DELHI 110 028
AND PUBLISHED BY NARENDRA PRAKASH JAIN FOR
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS PUBLISHERS PRIVATE LIMITED,
BUNGALOW ROAD, DELHI 110 007

WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY LINGUISTIC SERIES

Edited by

TO E.

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME ONE

List of Chapters

List of Chapter-subdivisions

PREFACE

NEARLY TWO DECADES ago I began tentative studies which have grown into the present work, the first attempt at a description of the grammar and lexicon of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. By no means all, but the major part, of my research activity during these two decades has gone into this work. I know that especially the dictionary falls short of what I wish it were. If I could take the time to repeat the whole process, that is to restudy carefully and minutely all the texts included in my plan, I am certain that these volumes could be enlarged and brought nearer to completion.

One limitation has been self-imposed. I have deliberately excluded words and forms occurring (with the same meanings) in standard Sanskrit. For this reason, in order to interpret BHS texts, one must supplement my grammar and dictionary by Sanskrit grammars and Sanskrit dictionaries, especially the lexicons of Boehtlingk (and Roth), which I treat as containing substantially the Sanskrit word-stock. (They also contain some words and meanings which are not standard Sanskrit but BHS; these are, of course, included in my work.)

I have no doubt that some competent scholars will question the wisdom of this limitation. I ask them at least not to condemn it until they have carefully considered my reasons, which are stated in Chapter 1, especially §§ 1.57 ff., to which §§ 1.33–56 furnish a necessary background. I admit that at first sight it may seem startling that a dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit should contain no article on, for instance, the word *nirvāṇa*, because in the texts included in this work I have failed to find any use of that word which is not adequately covered for standard Sanskrit by Boehtlingk. This is not to deny that in certain works of technical Buddhist metaphysics, composed in standard Sanskrit and therefore not considered by me, philosophical aspects of the meaning of *nirvāṇa* may depart considerably from those recognized by Boehtlingk. But, unless I have erred, the Northern Buddhists who used BHS did not use the word *nirvāṇa* in any way not known to their brahmanical fellow-countrymen. To this fact (and I believe it is a fact) the silence of my dictionary bears eloquent testimony. It does not, to be sure, guarantee the converse, namely that every standard Sanskrit word is used in BHS in *all* its Sanskrit meanings; that is far from being true. What I have tried to do is to record all non-Sanskrit elements, grammatical or lexical, found in BHS. The elements common to Sanskrit and to the BHS texts *as we have them* cannot safely be assumed to be genuine BHS, for reasons explained in the place cited; that is why I have omitted them.

I considered seriously providing the Grammar with an index. No doubt the lack of it may seem a defect to some. It would have added to the already swollen bulk of this work, and I finally decided that it was made unnecessary by the following considerations. The Table of Contents is very detailed, and, it is hoped, analyzes the grammar so clearly as to make an index scarcely profitable. The Dictionary also, to a large extent, replaces such an index.

The verb-forms, for which an index might seem more needed than for other parts of the grammar, are summarily analyzed by roots in Chapter 43, the Synopsis of Verb Forms. This chapter especially, and also all the rest of the Grammar and the Dictionary, contain many cross-references to sections of the Grammar in which grammatical features, especially less obvious ones, are recorded.

After finishing the Grammar and Dictionary, I decided to publish with them, or shortly after, a Reader containing selections from the most important texts, which are hardly accessible except in large libraries. It is hoped that this third volume will facilitate the use of the other two, and prove helpful to Indologists, both for private reading and in conducting university courses.

In my lamented ignorance of Chinese and Japanese, I have often applied for help in dealing with those languages to various Sinological or Japanological colleagues, past or present. Those who have contributed most, in addition to Mr. Chang Kun (who is mentioned below), are Professors Kan-ichi Asakawa (deceased), Chao Yuen-ren, George A. Kennedy, Li Fang-kuei, Lo Ch'ang-pei, and Johannes Rahder. I am deeply indebted to all these gentlemen for their unvarying patience and helpfulness.

Mr. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, England, generously put at my disposal some of his notes on the Tibetan version of the Divyāvadāna, supplementing his valuable Notes in JRAS 1950.166 ff.

Professor Paul Mus, at present my colleague at Yale, most generously volunteered to help in the final checking of quotations and references, and did a considerable part of the labor of checking those from the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa. In doing so he made a number of corrections and at least one notable improvement in the Dictionary; the article *cīraka* is almost wholly his work, and I am proud to be able to include it.

My very able pupil, Mr. Chang Kun, gave me invaluable help by checking the quotations and references from a number of texts, including some of the greatest importance, such as the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, the Gaṇḍavyūha, and the Mahāvyutpatti. His knowledge of Tibetan and of his native Chinese, as well as of Sanskrit, made his assistance especially important.

My secretary, Miss Eleanor A. Hill, who also knows Sanskrit, has helped by checking the quotations and references from a number of texts. She has typed the entire work, much of it more than once and some of it more than twice (owing to no fault of hers), with extraordinary skill and efficiency. She has made many other valuable contributions; for example, the subdivisions and typographical arrangement of the parts of the grammar owe much to her intelligence and skill. It would be hard to overstate what she has done to lighten my labors in preparing this work for publication.

Another able pupil of mine, Miss Betty Jean Shefts, cooperated with Miss Hill in reading the first proof of the entire Grammar and Dictionary. These two readers, who showed remarkable competence at this none too easy task, have notably reduced the number of misprints and other errors which would have escaped my own proof reading.

The publication has been very materially assisted by generous financial support from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation. To it, and to its Secretary General, Mr. Henry Allen Moe, and Assistant Secretary, Mr. James F. Mathias, I am very deeply indebted.

Even with this help, the publication would perhaps not have been possible without the

generosity of the Yale University Press in issuing it, an undertaking which will certainly not be financially profitable. I am especially grateful to Provost E. S. Furniss, at that time Director of the Press, whose influence certainly had much to do with these arrangements.

I cannot close without an expression of gratitude to my friend William Clyde DeVane, Dean of Yale College. He is himself a great humanist, and one of the most effective supporters of humanistic research whom I know. This makes me the more appreciative of the unwavering confidence he has shown in my ability to accomplish the task I undertook in this work—a confidence which has been shown in various ways, and which has had important practical results. If it should prove that this confidence was not seriously misplaced, I know he would feel rewarded.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

THE BHS TEXTS fall roughly into three main classes, as regards their language. These may possibly, if only loosely, represent successive chronological layers in the tradition. It must be emphasized, however, that such a chronological classification does not necessarily apply to the original composition of the texts in question, but only to the forms in which they are now preserved to us. Some of them are known to have undergone changes, always in the direction of greater Sanskritization (see §§ 1.39 ff.; note for example the facts about Vaj, § 1.41, which is put in my third class). Winternitz (Hist. Ind. Lit. 2.314) holds that the Prajñā-Pāramitās 'belong to the earliest Mahāyāna-Sūtras . . . A Prajñā-Pāramitā was already translated into Chinese as early as 179 A.D.' Yet AsP and ŚsP, the two works of this class which I have included, belong linguistically in my third class, in the forms now preserved to us; they contain practically no verses, and very little non-Sanskrit morphology.

1. The first class consists only of Mv, plus a short citation from the lost Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka (in Śikṣ), and a short Jātaka printed in the Appendix to Jm. In these works, the prose parts are thoroughly hybridized, showing as many Middle-Indicisms as the verses. In its 'nucleus', at least, Mv seems to be the oldest BHS text we have; and this linguistic type is surely older than the other two.

2. In the second class, the verses are hybridized, as in the first class, but the prose contains relatively few signs of Middle Indic phonology or morphology. However, the vocabulary, at least, stamps even the prose as BHS. In this class belong SP, LV, Gv (including Bhad), KP, Dbh, RP, Sukh, Samādh, Suv, Ud (contains no prose), and nearly all of Śikṣ (which consists mainly of quotations from older texts, many of which are not otherwise preserved).

3. In the third class, even the verses (if any; some of these texts contain few or none; those which have none could be included in the second class) are substantially as Sanskritized as the prose parts; the entire text of these works resembles linguistically the prose parts of the second class. That is, non-Sanskritic forms are not common; the vocabulary is the clearest evidence that they belong to the BHS tradition. These include MSV, Divy, Av, Prāt, Mmk, Bbh, AsP, ŚsP, Māy, Bhīk, Karmav, Kv, Laṅk, Vaj, and Jm; here belong also the vocabulary-lists in Dharmas and Mvy, and most of the miscellaneous short texts collected in Sādh, so far as they are not standard Sanskrit, which not a few of them seem to be.

Except as otherwise stated below, references are to page and line of editions.

Abbreviations of Texts from which BHS forms are cited

AbhidhK. = Abhidharmakośa, transl. LaVallée Poussin, Paris and Louvain, 1923–31; many technical words cited from Index, transl., and notes. References, as in the Index, are to Book (of the original) and page of the translation.

AbhK. = preceding.

AdP Konow MASI = Sten Konow, Central Asian Fragments of the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikā, in Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 69, 1942. Only a few rare and important words.

AsP = Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, ed. Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta, 1888.

Av = Avadāna-śataka, ed. Speyer, 2 vols., St. Petersburg, 1902, 1906; transl. Feer, Annales du Musée Guimet 18 (1891).

Bbh = Bodhisattvabhūmi, ed. Wogihara, Tokyo, 1930—36. Includes the editor's dissertation, Lexikalisches aus der Bodhisattvabhūmi, which is referred to as Wogihara, Lex.

Bcṭ, Bca.ṭ. = Bodhicaryāvatāra-ṭīkā, ed. LaVallée Poussin, Brussels, 1898. Technical terms cited from Index.

Bhad = Bhadracarī, ed. Watanabe, Leipzig, 1912. Identical with Gv 543.9–548.2. Cited by numbered verses.

Bhīk = Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā, ed. Ridding and LaVallée Poussin, BSOS 1, Part 3, 123–143. Cited by page and line of the manuscript as reproduced in ed.

Buddhac. = Buddhacarita, ed. Johnston, Calcutta, 1935. The language is standard Skt.; a few words, chiefly religious, are cited by chapter and verse.

Calc. = Calcutta; see LV.

Dbh = Daśabhūmikasūtra, ed. Rahder, Paris and Louvain, 1926.

Dbh.g. = id. (Gāthā portion), ed. (Rahder and) Susa, Eastern Buddhist, 5.337 ff. and 6.51 ff., cited from reprint with consecutively numbered pages 1–58; the pages of the reprint are cited first, then in parentheses the pages of the original, then the line on each page.

Dbs = Daśabalasūtra, in Waldschmidt, Kl. Skt. Texte 4, 209 ff.

Dharmas = Dharmasaṃgraha, ed. Müller, Oxford, 1885. Cited by section numbers.

Divy = Divyāvadāna, ed. Cowell and Neil, Cambridge, 1886.

Foucaux, see LV.

Guhyasamāja, ed. Bhattacharya, Gaekwad's Oriental Series 53, Baroda, 1931; contains a few verses with BHS forms; very rarely cited.

Gv = Gaṇḍavyūha, ed. Suzuki and Idzumi, Kyoto, 1934–36; 2d ed., photographically reproduced with corrections, 1949.

Hoernle, see MR.

Jm = Jātakamālā, ed. Kern (HOS 1), Boston, 1891. Its language is close to standard Skt., but contains quite a number of BHS words, and even a few forms; see § 1.53, fn. 17. Transl. Speyer, London, 1895.

K', see SP.

Karmav = (Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga, and Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa, ed. Lévi, Paris, 1932

Kl. Skt. Texte = Kleinere Sanskrit Texte (5 vols.; Kgl. Preuss. Turfan-Expeditionen), Leipzig (Vol. 1 Berlin), 1911–39.

KN, see SP.

KP = Kāśyapa Parivarta, ed. Staël-Holstein, Shanghai, 1926. Cited by sections as numbered in edition, and lines.

Kv = Kāraṇḍavyūha, in The Hindu Commentator, vol. 5; 1872.

Laṅk = Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra, ed. Nanjio, Kyoto, 1923; transl. Suzuki, London, 1932; Index, by Suzuki, Kyoto, 1934; 'Studies' = Suzuki, Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra, London, 1930.

Lefm., see LV.

LV = Lalitavistara, ed. Lefmann, Halle, 1902; Critical Apparatus, 1908; abbreviated Lefm.; 'Calc.' = ed. of Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta, 1877; transl. Foucaux, Annales du Musée Guimet 6, and Notes, 19; Tibetan version (partial), with transl., by Foucaux, Paris, 1847; Weller = F. Weller, Zum Lalita Vistara, I. Über die Prosa des Lal. Vist., Leipzig, 1915.

MadhK = Mūla-Madhyamaka-kārikās, with comm., ed. LaVallée Poussin, St. Petersburg, 1903–1910. Only partially excerpted.

Mahāsamāj. = Mahāsamājasūtra, in Waldschmidt, Kl. Skt. Texte 4.

Māy = Mahā-Māyūrī. Two figures refer to page and line of ed. by Oldenbourg in Zapiski Vostochnago Otdelenija Imp. Russk. Archeol. Obschestva, Tom 11 (1899), 218–261. A single number refers to the numbered lines of 'Le catalogue géographique des yakṣa dans la Mahā-Māyūrī', by S. Lévi, JAs. XI. 5 (1915), pp. 1–138.

Megh = Meghasūtra, ed. Bendall, JRAS 1880, 288 ff.

Minaeff, see Mvy.

Mironov, see Mvy.

Mmk = (Ārya-)Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, ed. Gaṇapati Śāstri, 3 vols., Trivandrum, 1920, 1922, 1925. See Lalou, in the following list of abbreviations.

MPS = E. Waldschmidt, Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra. 3 parts; Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie . . . zu Berlin, 1950, 1951. Arrived too late to be extensively used; references are to Waldschmidt's numbered divisions.

(Hoernle) MR = Hoernle (general editor), Manuscript Remains of Buddhist literature found in Eastern Turkestan, Oxford, 1916. BHS fragments ed. by Hoernle, Lüders, Pargiter, Thomas.

MSV = Mūla-Sarvāstivāda-Vinaya; Gilgit Manuscripts, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt, Vol. 3, Parts i (undated), ii (1942), iii (1943), Srinagar, Kashmir. Part iv (1950) arrived late, but its most important words have been included. Unfortunately this valuable series came to hand so late in the progress of my task that I felt it impossible to include Volumes 1 and 2, which seem somewhat less important.

Mv = Mahāvastu, ed. Senart, Paris, 1882, 1890, 1897. The first volume of Jones's translation (London, 1949) appeared, to my regret, too late to be much used (I received it in 1950).

Mvy = Mahāvyutpatti. Cited by numbered entries in ed. of Sakaki, Kyoto, 1916, with Sanskrit and Tibetan Indexes, 1925 and 1936; some variants are cited from Mironov (2d ed. of Minaeff, which is cited in BR and pw), St. Petersburg, 1910–11. Tibetan version cited from Sakaki; also translations of many Chinese and Japanese renderings *ibidem*.

Pischel, SBBA 1904 pp. 807–827: Bruchstücke des Sanskritkanons der Buddhisten aus Idykutšari. A few rarer words cited by number of page and manuscript-folio.

Prāt = Prātimokṣasūtra des Sarvāstivādins, ed. Finot (with translation of Chinese version by Huber), JAs. XI.2 (1913), 473 ff.

RP = Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā, ed. Finot, St. Petersburg, 1901.

Sādh = Sādhanamālā, ed. Bhattacharya, Baroda, 2 vols., 1925, 1928.

Śāl = Śālistambasūtra, (reconstructed) ed. LaVallée Poussin; Bouddhisme, Études et matériaux, Théorie des douze causes (Gand, 1913), pp. 69–90.

Samādh = Samādhirājasūtra, (1) chapters 8, 19, 22, ed. Régamey, Warsaw, 1938, cited by chapters and numbered sections or verses; (2) ed. Das and Vidyābhūshan (Calcutta, 1896); references (only a few; text incredibly corrupt) cited by page and lien, thus: 'p. —, line —'.

Saṃy. Āg. = Saṃyuktāgama; fragments from Stein mss. ed. LaVallée Poussin, JRAS 1913, 569 ff.; a few references to numbers of fragments (1–15), followed by r(ecto) or v(erso) when necessary, and line of mss.

Śikṣ = Śikṣāsamuccaya, ed. Bendall, St. Petersburg, 1897–1902; transl. Bendall and Rouse, London, 1922.

SP = Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, ed. Kern and Nanjio, St. Petersburg, 1912, abbreviated KN; supplementary references to ed. of Wogihara and Tsuchida, Tokyo, 1934–35, abbreviated WT; fragments of 'Kashgar' or Central Asiatic recension, ed. Thomas and Lüders, ap. Hoernle, MR 133 ff., 144 ff.; others, ed. LaVallée Poussin, JRAS 1911.1070 ff.; transl. Burnouf (Lotus de la Bonne Loi, Paris, 1852), and Kern (SBE 21, Oxford, 1884). Tibetan citations chiefly from block-print in my possession, partly from WT. When my work was practically ready for print, my colleague Professor Rahder received, and lent to me, the photostatic reproduction of the ms. referred to by WT as K′. It has been cited a very few times. The quotations from it in WT seem to be very inaccurate.

ŚsP = Śatasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā, ed. P. Ghoṣa, Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1902 ff.

Sukh = Sukhāvatīvyūha ('Larger' and 'Smaller'), ed. Müller, Oxford, 1883.

Sūtrāl. = Asaṅga, Mahāyāna-sūtrālaṃkāra, ed. and transl. Lévi, Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, 159 and 190, Paris, 1907, 1911. The language is standard Skt., but the text and Lévi's notes are important for the understanding of many technical terms. Cited by chapter and verse (with commentary after each verse).

Suv = Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra, ed. Nobel, Leipzig, 1937; Tibetan version, ed. same, Leiden and Stuttgart, 1944.

Svay = (Vṛhat-)Svayambhū Purāṇa, ed. Haraprasad Sastri, Calcutta, 1894–1900; of very little use and only rarely cited. Cf. Winternitz, Hist. Ind. Lit. II, 376, note.

Ud = Udānavarga; chap. 1–21, ed. Chakravarti (1930; except ch. 4, for which see Lévi, JAs. X. 20, 1912, 203 ff.); ch. 29, ed. Pischel, SBBA 1908, 968 ff.; ch. 30, 31, 32, ed. LaVallée Poussin, JRAS 1912, 369 ff. Cited by chapter and verse.

Vaj = Vajracchedikā, ed. Müller, Oxford, 1881; fragments of Central Asiatic version, ed. Pargiter, ap. Hoernle MR 179 ff.

Weller, see LV.

Wogihara, Lex., see Bbh.

WT, see SP.

Other abbreviations and works chiefly referred to

AB = Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

Abhidh-s. = Abhidhammatthasaṃgaha (Pali).

abl. = ablative.

ABORI = Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Poona).

abstr. = abstract.

acc. = according; accusative.

Acharya (P.K.), Dict(ionary of) Hindu Arch(itecture), Oxford Univ. Press, n.d. [1927?].

act. = active; action.

Add. = Addendum, Addenda (e.g. to BR, pw).

adj. = adjective.

AIS = Delbrück, Altindische Syntax.

Ait. Br. = Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.

AKM = Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.

al. = alibi, elsewhere.

Alsdorf, see Kum.

Amarak. = Amarakośa.

AN = Aṅguttaranikāya (Pali).

analog. = analogical(ly).

aor. = aorist.

ap. = *apud*.

Ap. = Apabhraṃśa; Apadāna (Pali text).

app. = apparently.

App. = Appendix.

ApŚ! = Āpastamba Śrauta Sūtra.

Apte = Apte, Student's Sanskrit-English Dictionary (1922).

ASGW = Abhandlungen der sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.

assoc. = associated.

AV. = Atharvaveda.

AVPariś. = Atharvaveda Pariśiṣṭa.

Āyār. = Āyāraṅga Sutta (AMg.).

B. = Buddha.

B (as in Wh. Roots) = Brāhmaṇa(s).

B. in Tr. (Warren) = Warren's Buddhism in Translations, HOS. 3.

BEFEO = Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient.

BhāgP. = Bhāgavata Purāṇa.

Bhav. = Bhavisattakahā (Ap.), ed. Jacobi (1918).

BhG. = Bhagavad Gītā.

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit.

Bhvr. = Bahuvrīhi.

Bibl. Bu. = Bibliotheca Buddhica.

Bloch (Jules), (L')Indo-Aryen, Paris, 1934.

Bloch (Jules), (Les Inscriptions d') Asoka, Paris, 1950.

BR = Boehtlingk and Roth, Sanskrit Wörterbuch.

Br. = Brāhmaṇas (language of).

BSL = Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique (de Paris).

BSOS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies, London.

Bu. = Buddhist.

Bull(etin of the) Deccan Coll(ege) Research Inst(itute) (Poona).

Burnouf, Intr. = Introduction à l'histoire du bouddhisme indien (1844).

Burnouf, Lotus = transl. of SP, q.v. in preceding list.

Burrow (T.), (The languages of the) Kharoṣṭhi Documents, Cambridge, 1937.

Bv, Bu.v. = Buddha-vaṃsa (Pali).

Car. = Caraka.

caus. = causative.

cf. = compare.

ch., chap. = chapter.
Childers = Dictionary of the Pali Language, R. C. Childers.
Chin. = Chinese.
Cl. Skt. = Classical Sanskrit.
comb. = combination.
comm. = commentary.
comp. = composition.
Compendium of Philosophy (Aung and Rhys Davids, London, 1910).
compv. = comparative.
corr. = correct(s), correction.
corresp. = correspondent, corresponding, corresponds.
Corrig. = Corrigenda.
cpd. = compound.
CPD = Andersen and Smith, Critical Pali Dictionary (Vol. 1), Copenhagen, 1924 ff.
crit. app. = critical apparatus.
Das = S. C. Das, Tibetan-English Dictionary.
Daśak. = Daśakumāracarita.
dat. = dative.
def. = definition.
denom. = denominative.
der(iv). = derived, derivative.
Deśīn. = Deśīnāmamālā, ed. Pischel, Bombay, 1880.
Dhātup. = Dhātupāṭha.
Dhp. = Dhammapada (Pali); Dhp. c(omm.), commentary on Dhp.; Fausb. refers to Fausböll's ed. of Dhp.
Dhs. = Dhammasaṃgani (Pali).
dial. = dialectic.
Dict. = Dictionary, usually referring to my Dict. of BHS; Dictt. = Dictionaries.
Dict. of the Fr. Cath. Miss. = the Tibetan Dictionary of the French Catholic Mission.
Dict. Hindu Arch. = Acharya, Dictionary of Hindu Architecture.
diff. = different.
dim. = diminutive.
Dīp. = Dīpavaṃsa (Pali).
DN = Dīghanikāya (Pali).
DPPN = Malalasekara, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names.
Dpv., Dpvs. = Dīp.
Dutreuil (de Rhins ms.), see § 1.3 with fn. 2.
E = Epic (Sanskrit, in citing Whitney's Roots).
ed. = editor, edition.
em. = emended, emendation.
ep. = epithet.
Ep. Zeyl. = Epigraphia Zeylanica.
equiv. = equivalent.
erron. = erroneously.
etym. = etymology.
esp. = especially.
exc. = except.
expl. = explained, explanation.
f. = feminine; following.
fem. = feminine.
Fest. = Festschrift.
ff. = following.
fig. = figurative(ly).
fn. = footnote.
foll. = followed (by); following.
fut. = future.
gdve. = gerundive.
Geiger (W.) = Pali, Strassburg, 1916. Cited by numbers of sections, without the symbol §.
gen. = genitive.
ger. = gerund.
Ger. = German.
Gīt. = Gītagovinda.
GobhGS = Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra.
GOS = Gaekwad's Oriental Series.
Gr. = Grammar, grammatical, grammarian(s).
haplogr. = haplography.
haplol. = haplology.
Hem. = Hemacandra, chiefly his Prakit Grammar, ed. and transl. Pischel, Halle, 1877, 1880; see also Deśīn.
HJAS = Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.
HOS = Harvard Oriental Series.
Hultzsch (E.), Inscr(iptions) of Asoka, Oxford, 1925.
IA. = (Lassen) Indische Altertumskunde.
IF. = Indogermanische Forschungen.
ifc. = at the end of compounds.
IHQ = Indian Historical Quarterly.
impf. = imperfect.
impv. = imperative.
incl. = including, inclusive.
indecl. = indeclinable.
indic. = indicative.
Ind. Min. = (Garbe) Die indischen Mineralien (1882).
Ind. Spr. = Boehtlingk, Indische Sprüche (2d ed.).
inf. = infinitive.
inst., instr. = instrumental.
intens. = intensive.
intrans. = intransitive.
I.St. = Indische Studien (Weber).
It., Itiv. = Itivuttaka (Pali).
JA. = Journal Asiatique.
Jä., see Jäschke.
Jacobi, Ausgew. Erz. = Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī. See also Bhav., San.
JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society.
Jap. = Japanese.
JAs. = JA.
(Jä.,) Jäschke = Jäschke, Tibetan-English Dictionary.
Jāt. = Jātaka (Pali).
JB. = Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa.
JM. = Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī.
JPTS = Journal of the Pali Text Society.
JR (Vikramacarita) = Jainistic Recension of the Vikr., see HOS 26–27.
JRAS = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
JŚ. = Jaina Śaurasenī.
Karmadh. = Karmadhāraya.
Kāś. = Kāśikā (comm. on Pāṇ.).
Kauś. = Kauśika Sūtra.
Kauṭ. (Arth.) = Kauṭilīya (Arthaśāstra).
Kh.p., Khud.p. (comm.) = Khuddaka-pāṭha (commentary) (Pali).
Kirfel, Kosm. = Kosmographie der Inder.
KSA = Kāṭhaka Saṃhitā, Aśvamedhagrantha.
KSS = Kathāsaritsāgara.
KŚS = Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
Kull. = Kullūka.
Kum. = Kumārapālapratibodha (Ap.), ed. Alsdorf.
Kvu. = Kathā-vatthu (Pali).
Lalou, Iconographie (des étoffes peintes dans le Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa), Paris, 1930.
E. Lamotte, Mél. chin. et boud. = Mélanges chinoises et bouddhiques.
Lang. = Language (Journal of the Linguistic Society of America).
Lāṭy. = Lāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra.
l. c. = in the place cited.
lect. diff. = lectio difficilior.
lect. fac. = lectio facilior.
lex. = lexicon, lexical; see also Bbh, in the preceding list of abbreviations.
Lin Li-kouang, (L')Aide-Mémoire (de la Vraie Loi), Paris, 1949.
lit. = literal(ly); also, literary, found in literature, as opposed to lex.
loc. = locative.
M. = Māhārāṣṭrī.

m. = masculine.
Mahāv. = Mahāvaṃsa (Pali).
Mārk. Pur. = Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa.
masc. = masculine.
math. = mathematics.
Mbh. = Mahābhārata.
m.c. = metri causa. I include under this term two classes of cases, because in both I find evidence for believing that metrical considerations were either the exclusive or the dominant reason for the use of the form in question. The first includes any cases of a particular form which is never used in prose, or in positions in a verse where the alternative ('regular') form would fit as well. The second includes cases in which the form labelled 'm.c.' is indeed also used (elsewhere) in prose or metrically indifferent positions, but in such limited or specialized ways (which vary in different cases) that I still believe the choice was determined, in the cases under consideration where the term 'm.c.' occurs, by meter. In both types, of course, the alternative ('regular') form would be impossible in a specific context where it is labelled 'm.c.' It is hoped that my manner of presentation will make it easy to distinguish the two types. Frequency of occurrence, and use of corresponding forms in other MIndic dialects, are important considerations to which I have tried to give due weight.
Mehendale (M.A.), Hist(orical) Gr(ammar) of Inscr(iptional) Pkts., Poona, 1948.
metr. = metrical(ly).
Meyer, Kauṭ. (Arth.) = J. J. Meyer's translation of Kauṭ., Leipzig, 1926.
mg. = meaning.
Mg. = Māgadhī.
Miln.(p.), Milp. = Milindapañha (Pali).
MIndic or MInd. = Middle Indic.
misc. = miscellaneous.
MN = Majjhimanikāya (Pali).
Mṛcch. = Mṛcchakaṭikā.
ms(s). = manuscript(s).
MS = Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā.
MSL = Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique (de Paris).
Mus (P.), Barabudur (1935).
mus. = musical.
MW = Monier Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary (2d ed., 1899).
n. = nominative; name.
n. pr. = proper name.
n. act. = noun of action.
n. ag. = noun of agent.
Nachtr., see Schmidt.
NAWGött. = Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.
neg. = negative.
Neisser, Z. Wbch. d. RV.: W. Neisser, Zum Worterbuch des Rigveda.
Nep. = Nepalese.
Nett. = Nettipakaraṇa (Pali).
NIA = New Indian Antiquary.
Nidd[1] = Mahā-Niddesa (Pali).
Nir. = Yāska's Nirukta.
nom. = nominative.
nom. act. = noun of action.
nom. ag. = noun of agent.
nt. = neuter.
obj. = object.
obl. = oblique.
onomat. = onomatopoetic.
opp. = opposite (of).
opt. = optative.
orig. = original(ly).
Pāṇ. = Pāṇini.
Pañc. Rec. = Edgerton, Pañchatantra Reconstructed.
pass. = passive.
Pat. = Patañjali.
PBr. = Pañcaviṃśa Brāhmaṇa.
pej. = pejorative.
perh. = perhaps.
pers. = person.
Philologica Indica (reprints of monographs by H. Lüders), Göttingen, 1940.
Pischel (without further reference) = Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen, Strassburg, 1900. Cited as under Geiger.
Pkt. = Prakrit.
pl. = plural.
postp., postpos. = postposition.
ppp. = past passive participle.
prec. = precative; preceding; preceded.
pres. = present.
prob. = probably.
Proc(eedings of the) Am(erican) Philos(ophical) Soc(iety).
Przyluski, Aśoka = La Légende de l'Empereur Açoka, Paris, 1923.
PTSD = Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary.
Pug(g). = Puggala Paññatti (Pali).
Pv. = Petavatthu (Pali).
pw = Boehtlingk, Sanskrit Wörterbuch in kürzerer Fassung.
qy = query.
Rājat(ar). = Rājataraṃgiṇī (ed. Stein).
Rām. = Rāmāyaṇa (NWRām. = Northwestern Rām.)
Ratnach. = Ratnachandra, Ardha-Māgadhī Dictionary (5 vols.).
rec. = recension.
ref. = reference(s).
Renou (Louis), without specific reference, or Gr. scte., = Grammaire sanscrite, Paris, 1930.
Renou (Louis), Études de grammaire Sanskrite, Paris, 1936.
RO = Rocznik Orjentalistyczny.
RV = Rig Veda.
S (as in Wh. Roots) = Sūtra(s).
Ś. = Śaurasenī.
San., Sanatk. = Sanatkumāracaritam (Ap.), ed. Jacobi (1921).
Saundarān. = Saundarānanda, ed. Johnston.
ŚB. = Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (Mādhy. = Mādhyaṃdina, K. = Kāṇva recension).
SBBA = Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften.
SBE = Sacred Books of the East.
sc. = scilicet.
Schmidt, Nachtr. = R. Schmidt, Nachträge zum Sanskrit Wörterbuch . . . von Otto Boehtlingk.
Sdhp. = Saddhammopāyana (Pali).
Sen = Sukumar Sen, An outline syntax of Buddhistic Sanskrit, in Journal of the Department of Letters, Univ. of Calcutta, (XVII) (1928).
sg. = singular.
Sheth = H.D.T. Sheth, Paia-sadda-mahaṇṇavo (Pkt.-Hindi Dict.), Calcutta, 1923–1928.
Skt. = Sanskrit; (hyper-)Sktism, Sktization = Sanskritism, Sanskritization.
Skt. Synt. = Speyer, Sanskrit Syntax.
Smith, Helmer, Les deux prosodies du vers bouddhique (see § 1.38, fn. 15).
Sn. = Suttanipāta (Pali).
SN. = Saṃyuttanikāya (Pali).
Speyer: see Skt. Synt., and VSS; also, in the preceding list, s.vv. Av and Jm.
subst. = substantive.
superl. = superlative.

Sūyag. = Sūyagaḍaṅgasutta (AMg.).
s.v(v). = under the word(s).
syn. = synonym(ous).
Tagare (G.V.), Hist(orical) Gr(ammar) of Ap(abhraṃśa), Poona, 1948.
Tatp(ur). = Tatpuruṣa.
TB. = Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.
Therag. = Theragāthā (Pali).
Therīg. = Therīgāthā (Pali).
Thīg. = Therīg.
Tib. = Tibetan.
Ting (Fu-Pao), Dictionary of Buddhist Chinese, 16 vols., Shanghai, 1920. In Chinese; a few references provided by Mr. Chang Kun.
Toch. = Tocharian (: Gram., Tocharische Grammatik, Sieg and Siegling).
trans. = transitive.
transl. = translation(s).
Trik. = Trikāṇḍaśeṣa (a Skt. lexicographer cited in BR; contains many BHS words).
TS. = Taittirīya Saṃhitā.
Turner (R.L.), Nep. Dict. = Dictionary of the Nepali Language, London, 1931.
U (as in Wh. Roots) = Upaniṣads.
Uhlenbeck (C.C.) = Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache (Amsterdam, 1898–99).
uncpd. = uncompounded.
unmetr. = unmetrical(ly).
var(r). = variant(s).
Varāh.Bṛh.S. = Varāhamihira, Bṛhat-saṃhitā.
vb. = verb.
Ved. = Vedic.
Ved. St. = Pischel and Geldner, Vedische Studien (3 vols.).
Ved. Var., Vedic Variants, see VV.
Versl. en Med. d. K. Akad. v. Wet. Amsterdam = Proceedings of the Amsterdam Academy.
Vin. = Vinayapiṭaka (Pali).
Vism., Vis.M. = Visuddhi-magga (Pali).
v.l., vv.ll. = variant reading(s).
voc. = vocative.
VS. = Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā.
vs, vss = verse, verses.
VSS = Speyer, Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax.
VV = Bloomfield, Edgerton, and Emeneau, Vedic Variants, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1930, 1932, 1934.
Vv. = Vimānavatthu (Pali).
Wack(ernagel), AIGr. = Altindische Grammatik, Göttingen, 1896, 1905, 1930.
Warren (H. C.), B(uddhism) in Transl(ations) (= HOS 3; 1896).
Wh. = Whitney; Gr., Sanskrit Grammar; Roots (Verb-forms and primary derivatives).
Wilson = H. H. Wilson's Sanskrit Dictionary, as cited in MW.
Winternitz, H(ist). I(nd). Lit. = W's History of Indian Literature (English version; vols. 1 and 2, Calcutta, 1927 and 1933).
w.r. = wrong reading.
Yājñ. = Yājñavalkya (Dharmaśāstra).
ZDMG = Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZII = Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik.
Z.Wbch. d. RV., see Neisser.

Symbols

: (as in statements of proportional analogy) = 'is related to'.

( ) Parentheses, in the Dictionary, enclose articles on words which occur in standard Skt. in substantially the same meanings as in BHS, but which by exception, for one reason or another, seem to need treatment here. The reason is usually a (previous) erroneous interpretation, or sometimes what is felt to be a danger thereof.

[ ] Brackets, in the Dictionary, enclose articles on what are considered erroneous readings. They are, however, also used in the interior of an article, in lieu of parentheses which, if used, would fall within other parentheses.

1. Introduction

Languages used in early Buddhism

1.1. Buddhist religious texts have been preserved in at least four Indic languages.

1.2. One is standard Sanskrit, used for example by the poet Aśvaghoṣa (attributed to the 2d century A.D.).[1]

1.3. Two of the others are Middle Indic. The better known, which contains the largest Buddhist literature now preserved in any Indic language, is Pali, the sacred language of Southern Buddhism. Most scholars now believe that it is, in the main, based on a western, or west-central, Middle Indic vernacular. The other is the dialect of the 'Prakrit Dharmapada' (ms. Dutreuil de Rhins) published by Senart in JAs. IX.12 (1898), pp. 193 ff. It was based on a northwestern Middle Indic.[2] There is no need for me to discuss these languages further at this point. Especially Pali will be very often mentioned, for comparative purposes, thruout my Grammar and Dictionary.

1.4. There remains the subject of this work, which I call Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (abbreviated BHS). Most North Indian Buddhist texts are composed in it. It is based primarily on an old Middle Indic vernacular not otherwise identifiable. But there seems reason to believe that it contains features which were borrowed (originally, or in the course of historical development, or both) from other Middle Indic dialects. In other words, even its Middle Indic aspects are dialectically somewhat mixed. (For that matter, we shall soon see that the same could be said of Pali, and probably of all other Middle Indic dialects of which we have any considerable knowledge.) Most strikingly, however, BHS was also extensively influenced by Sanskrit, from the very beginning of the tradition as it has been transmitted to us, and increasingly as time went on. Many (especially later) products of this tradition have often, tho I think misleadingly, been called simply 'Sanskrit', without qualification.

1.5. There have been attempts, as will be seen later, to identify the Middle Indic dialect on which this language was originally based. This question has also been somewhat blended, or confused, explicitly or implicitly, with the question of what language was used in what is presumed to have been the oldest, or 'original', form of the canonical literature of the Buddhists. Admittedly, no such 'original' canon is preserved to us.

1.6. The nature of the BHS language, and the question of an 'original' canonical language of Buddhism, can be understood best against the background of the attitude of early Buddhism towards the use of various languages as vehicles for its religious teaching. Fortunately that attitude can be quite clearly defined.

1.7. In the Pali canon (Cullavagga 5.33; Vin. ii.139.1 ff.) occurs a famous passage which, in abbreviated form, may be rendered thus:

> Two monks, brothers, brahmans by birth, of fine language and fine speech,[3] came to the Buddha and said: Lord, here monks of miscellaneous origin (literally, of various names, clan-names, races or castes, and families) are corrupting (*dūsenti*) the Buddha's words by (repeating them in) their own dialects; let us put them into Vedic.[4] The Lord Buddha rebuked them: Deluded men, how can you say this? This will not lead to the conversion of the unconverted... And he delivered a sermon and commanded (all) the monks: You are not to put the Buddha's words into Vedic. Who does so would commit a sin. I authorize you, monks, to learn the Buddha's words each in his own dialect.

---

1. 'His Sanskrit is faultless, even though it does not always comply strictly with the rules of Pāṇini' (Winternitz, Hist. Ind. Lit., vol. 2, 1933, p. 260). Very many brahmanical 'Sanskrit' works likewise fail to 'comply strictly' with these rules.

2. J. Bloch, JAs. 1912, I, p. 331 ff. This text, with a translation of Senart's French notes, and new textual and exegetic notes, was reprinted by B. Barua and S. Mitra, Calcutta, 1921; a new edition of the greater part of the text, with an index of words and bibliography, by H.W. Bailey, BSOS 11.488–512. I know of no evidence that Buddhist religious texts (such as might have formed parts of a canon, or have been ancillary to a canon) have been preserved to us in any other Middle Indic language. Aśoka's inscriptions, and most other Buddhist inscriptions, mainly memorial and votive, from the celebrated Piprawa vase (most recently treated by Lin Li-kouang, Aide-Mémoire 227; see note 6 below) onward, are not 'religious texts' in my sense. (See §§ 1.18 ff. for their bearing on dialects used in Buddhism.) The finds from Central Asia (Chinese Turkestan) have revealed such Buddhist texts only in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, and to some extent in standard Sanskrit (to ignore non-Indic languages). The 'Niya' inscriptions (Stein, Ancient Khotan, pp. 321, 364–8), published by Boyer, Rapson, Senart, and Noble, 3 vols., Oxford, 1920, 1927, 1929, seem to contain only two fragments of Buddhist religious texts (Nos. 510, 511), both in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, besides one set of nīti verses (which have no obvious distinctively Buddhist traits) in what is meant for standard Sanskrit (No. 523). The rest, in what has been called 'Niya Prakrit', seem to be purely secular. According to Konow, BSOS. 8.611, this and the dialect of the ms. Dutreuil de Rhins are 'closely connected forms of one and the same ancient dialect'.

3. *kalyāṇavācā* seems to mean that their language was cultivated and elegant; *kalyāṇavākkaraṇā*, that they were eloquent and mellifluous speakers (comm. *madhurasaddā*; similarly AN comm. ii.40.15 *kalyāṇavākkaraṇatā ti vacanakiriyāya madhurabhāvo*, 'mellifluence in the use of the voice, or of words').

4. *chandaso āropema*. Not, as some have thought, 'into verses', Sanskrit or other; the context makes it quite clear that *chandaso* means texts in a certain language or dialect; and more precisely in the Vedic language (whether prose or verse). This is the regular meaning of *chandas* in Pāṇini, and is familiar in Epic and Classical Sanskrit (BR s.v. 3). To these brahmans by birth, the proper language for sacred texts was Vedic (which included the Brāhmaṇa and Upsaniṣad dialects). Comm., *vedaṃ viya, sakkatabhāsāya* (not 'Sanskrit'! but 'respectable, elegant') *vācanāmaggaṃ āropema.*

1.8. The Pali commentator Buddhaghosa takes the last clause to mean rather 'in (the Buddha's) own dialect'; and some moderns (notably Geiger p. 5) follow him.[5] In my opinion, however, as in that of most scholars, there can be no real doubt of the above interpretation; and it is made doubly sure by several Chinese versions of the same incident,[6] which never speak of 'the Buddha's dialect'. Some of them specifically authorize use of 'the ordinary languages of each country' or the like. This is clearly a very old tradition, supported by closely parallel texts in both the northern and southern canons. It justifies us in assuming that the Buddha himself and his earliest disciples used only popular dialects as vehicles for their teachings, and refused to employ the venerated 'Vedic' language of the brahmans.

1.9. Taken together, the various reports of this incident seem to me to indicate more than that, and more than has usually been recognized. Let us look at some Chinese translations of lost Indic versions, as given by Lin Li-kouang (note 6).

1.10. The Vinava of the Mahīśāsaka sect, translated by Buddhajīva in 423–424 A.D., reports that the two originally brahman brothers heard monks reciting the sūtras 'incorrectly'. They ridiculed them, saying: 'Tho they have long since become monks, they recite the sūtras in *this* fashion! not knowing masculine and feminine gender, nor singular and plural, nor present, past, and future, nor long and short sounds (vowels), nor (metrically) light and heavy sounds (syllables).' [A student of BHS might be forgiven for thinking that the writer had this very dialect in mind! But most if not all of these 'errors' can be found in most Middle Indic dialects.] When they appealed to the Buddha, he ordered that the texts be recited 'according to the sounds of the regions, but taking care not to distort the meaning. It is forbidden to make of the Buddha's words an "outside" (non-Buddhist, heretical) language.'

1.11. The Vinaya of the Dharmagupta sect is closer to the Pali, but speaks of only one originally brahman monk, not two. He complained to the Buddha that 'monks of different clans and bearing different names were ruining the sūtras', and proposed to 'arrange them according to the good language of the world', that is, no doubt, Vedic or Sanskrit, the language of culture. In his rebuke the Buddha said that it would ruin the sūtras to use 'the language of heretics', and that 'it is allowed to recite and learn the Buddha's sūtras according to the interpretation of the popular languages of (various) regions.'

1.12. Even more striking for my purpose is the Chinese rendering (between 350 and 431 A.D.) of the lost Vinaya-mātṛkā ('Summary of the Discipline'). Here, the two monks of brahmanic origin say to the Buddha: 'Among the disciples there are men of different clans, of different countries, of different prefectures and sub-prefectures. Their *pronunciations* (lit. sounds of language) *are not the same.* As their languages are not correct, they all corrupt the true meaning of the Buddha.' They wish to compile and regulate the sūtras according to the 'Chando-(vi-)citi-śāstra'. The Buddha replies: 'In my religion, fine language is not recognized. All I want is that the meaning and reasoning be correct. You are to preach according to a pronunciation (lit. sound) which people can understand. Therefore it is proper to behave (sc. in the use of language) according to the countries.'

1.13. There are other, less close reflexes of this old passage, but they seem to add nothing important for my present purpose. The net result seems to me to show, not only that the Buddha authorized and commanded the recitation of his teachings in local dialects everywhere; but also that from the very start there were clearly perceptible differences in the speech of different members of the Buddhist order, which showed in their ways of reciting the sacred texts. 'Their pronunciations are not the same,' says the last quoted text; and if no other has been found recording this fact quite so clearly, others, including the Pali, emphasize the miscellaneous origins of the monks and the fact that the Buddha ordained that everyone, monks included, should use his own particular dialect in reciting the sacred texts.

An 'original language of Buddhism'?

1.14. In what sense, then, is it possible to assume *one* 'original language' of Buddhism?

1.15. The Buddha himself was an 'easterner'; his family lived at Kapilavastu, in northeastern Kosala (Oudh); his wanderings seem to have been chiefly bounded on the west by Śrāvastī (also in Kosala, tho considerably to the west of Kapilavastu) and on the east by Rājagṛha, the capital of Magadha (Bihar south of the Ganges). All this region belongs linguistically to what is now called modern Bihari (except that Śrāvastī may perhaps be just over the line in Eastern Hindi). Doubtless most of his disciples belonged to the same general region, and we may assume that, during the Buddha's lifetime, the Buddhist texts were mainly, at least, recited in eastern dialects. Yet no one knows just what dialect the Buddha spoke; and it seems clear that the dialects of his disciples differed perceptibly.

1.16. According to Buddhist tradition, shortly after the Master's death his chief followers met and tried to establish what we may call an approach to a canon, based on recitations of texts which they remembered. These, and in time other texts, were memorized and handed down by oral tradition, doubtless for centuries before writing came to be used for such purposes. This 'canon', at first vague and fluid, surely included narrations of the main events of the Buddha's life, and many sayings and sermons, in both verses and prose, which were attributed to him and set forth his principal doctrines; as well as rules for the life of his monkish followers. Other councils, one under Aśoka, were convened, which discussed the form and content of the canon.

1.17. Even from the beginning of this tradition, different dialects were used in these recitations, varying with the speech-habits of different monkish reciters. We have seen that such apparently was the custom during the Buddha's lifetime, and that he approved it and rejected any standardization. And as Buddhism spread, the texts certainly tended to become adapted in language to the vernaculars of regions to which they were brought by missionaries. This, too, was in accord with the Buddha's own instructions. In early days the adaptation was easy, and did not necessarily involve what we should dignify by the name 'translation'. Northern and central Indian dialects are predominantly Indo-Aryan, historically related to Sanskrit, even to this day. In late pre-Christian centuries the ancestors of these modern dialects were in the Middle Indic stage. They were still quite close to each other in

---

5. Buddhaghosa says 'the Māgadha language, spoken by the Buddha', which Geiger thinks means real Māgadhī, while Lin (see n. 6), p. 226, supposes that he referred to Pali. It makes little difference; Buddhaghosa was surely mistaken in any case.

6. First recorded (as far as I know) by S. Lévi, JAs. 1915, I, 441 ff., and more recently discussed at length by Lin Li-kouang, L'aide-mémoire de la vraie loi (Paris, 1949), 218 ff.

sounds and grammatical forms, and not too distant from their common mother tongue, which we may call 'Sanskrit', using that word in a way which Sanskritists will recognize as somewhat untechnical. So, the Buddha's injunction to make use of local dialects could be carried out with little conscious effort, in many cases. If not the missionary, at least his converts, in repeating the memorized lessons, would make the phonetic and morphological changes called for by the local vernacular, pretty much automatically, altho—N.B.!—we should not be surprised if we find a lack of complete consistency. In places which became thriving centers of Buddhist propaganda, there would in time tend to develop an increasingly crystallized canon, in a language based primarily on the local dialect.

1.18. This is not mere speculation. There is much evidence suggesting the one-time existence of Buddhist texts in a number of different ancient Middle Indic dialects, even tho such texts are actually preserved only in two or three. In an important article of 1912,[7] Sylvain Lévi showed this on the basis of essentially two types of evidence: first, aberrant (dialectically foreign) forms in Pali, and forms which seem aberrant in BHS (where lack of a formulated standard has made it harder to be sure what to call 'aberrant'); and secondly, proper names and other words occurring in titles and scraps of phraseology in Aśoka's inscriptions, and in other pre-Christian inscriptions like those of Bharhut, which allude to Buddhist literature.

1.19. Illustrations of the first kind of evidence could be multiplied. By way of further illustration of Lévi's point, I may note BHS *khāyati*, Pali ppp. *khāyita-*, for Skt. (and normal Pali and BHS) *khād-* 'eat'; and Prakritic causatives in *-āveti* (for regular *-āpeti* or *-āpayati*), sporadically in Pali and BHS (§§ 38.68 ff.). But since most Prakrits show loss of most intervocalic stops, and change of intervocalic *p* to *v*, these and the analogous cases cited by Lévi certainly prove no 'eastern' influence.

1.20. Some of the words cited by Lévi from early inscriptions lend more support to his conclusion (p. 511) that the (Buddhist Hybrid) Sanskrit and Pali canons are 'the late heirs of an older tradition, recited or redacted in a dialect now lost' which (if I understand Lévi correctly) was 'one of the languages of the land of Magadha.'[8]

1.21. I recognize the interest and value of Lévi's linguistic comparisons drawn from early inscriptions, and admit that some of them point towards the east, as indeed we should expect. Yet the most striking impression they make on me is their great variety. They most emphatically suggest lack of any dialectic agreement.

1.22. Take *Lāghula* = *Rāhula*[9]; *l* for *r* does indeed agree with Māgadhī, but *gh* for *h* is not normal to any Prakrit; it seems to be a hyper-Sanskritism. So, *cy* for *ty* in *adhigicya* is wholly isolated in Middle Indic. Lévi makes much of the *ya-śruti* in *avayesi* (p. 497) = Pali *avādesi*; but neither Mg. nor AMg. nor any Prakrit recorded by Pischel (187) has the *ya-śruti* before *e*; it is, to be sure, perhaps found in the old fragments of Buddhist dramas published by Lüders, Kl. Skt. Texte I, in the dialect which Lüders considers 'old AMg.' (*bhuṃjitaye*, inf., p. 39; but the origin of the ending is not entirely clear, cf. Lüders, p. 40 with n. 3). Most of Lévi's examples are widely, if not almost universally, found in Prakrits of all regions; or if not that, they are largely isolated, without clear parallels anywhere, like the forms just noted. In either case they do not help in defining geographically the dialect where they originated.

1.23. Lüders (op. cit. p. 41) believed that an 'old form' of Ardha-Māgadhī was the Buddha's native dialect, and also the language of the Buddhist canon in its oldest form. But he offered, in this place at least, no real linguistic evidence; only an expression of the opinion that 'Ardhamāgadhisms in the Pali canon, which in verses were not so easy to delete in rendering into Pali, are probably much more numerous than has heretofore been assumed.'

1.24. Hiän-lin Dschi also believes that 'Old Ardha-Māgadhī' was the 'original' language of the Buddhist canon (NAWGött. ph.-hist. Kl. 1944, 136, and especially ib. 1949, 269 ff.). He advances five arguments based on allegedly 'eastern' forms in BHS, specifically in Mv, viz.:

1.25. First, voc. pl. in *-āho*. This is found not only in Mg. (note: *not* in AMg.!), but also, as *-aho*, *-ahu*, in Apabhraṃśa (all varieties, and specifically in *Western* Ap., in all periods; cf. BSOS 8.512; Tagare, Hist. Gr. of Ap., 138 ff.). The short *a* is, of course, obviously a secondary shortening in Ap. This disproves the exclusively 'eastern' character of the ending.

1.26. Second, 'meistens ist vor *eva* ein *y* eingeschoben.' The form *yeva* after vowels, and sometimes after anusvāra, is extremely common in Pali, where it has every appearance of being a native form. It is much less common than *eva*, even after vowels, in Mv, and I have noted it in no other BHS work. Since it agrees with Pali, it is certainly no proof of 'eastern' connexions; and AMg. is reported to lack it (unless, perhaps, in the altered form *je*, Pischel 336), tho it is found in Mg.

1.27. Third, the alleged 1st (and 3d) sg. opt. ending *-ehaṃ* (*-eha*). On this see §§ 31.21, 22, where I discuss all the cases which can with any shadow of plausibility be assumed as verb forms. Dschi does not cite all those treated by me, but cites in addition *dadeha* Mv iii.46.14 (vs) and *upanayehaṃ* 82.14 (vs); these are certainly to be read *dade 'ha* (= *ahaṃ*; denasalization m.c.) and *upanaye 'haṃ* (for which, incidentally, the mss. read *upanaye*; *haṃ* is Senart's emendation, tho it may well be right). Many of the others are textually-doubtful. Some certainly contain the pronoun *(a)ham*. If the ending *-eha(ṃ)* has any real existence, which seems to me somewhat questionable, I believe it should be regarded as a future, not an optative. The Aśokan forms seem more likely to be real than any in Mv; they are not exclusively found in the eastern versions, tho the western occurrences are customarily explained by the facile assumption of 'Māgadhism'. In summary: it is doubtful whether BHS has a verbal ending *-eha(ṃ)* at all; if it does exist, it is probably a future, not an optative; and there is no good reason for regarding it as 'eastern'.

1.28. Fourth, *-āvo* for *-āyo* (§§ 1.84; 9.93). Dschi's note 7 on p. 271 fails to convince me that the replacement of *y* by *v* should be regarded as an 'easternism'. Most of the cases he cites, like the 3 pl. opt. ending *-vu* for *-yuḥ*, are not good parallels to *āvo* for *āyo*, since the following

---

7. JAs. 1912, II, 495–512, Observations sur une langue précanonique du Bouddhisme.

8. Surely this is geographically too narrow, in any case. Neither the Buddha's original home (Kapilavastu), nor Śrāvastī, one of his favorite dwelling places, nor Benares, where he preached his first sermon and stayed at other times, nor Kuśinagarī (Pali Kusinārā), the place of his death, was in Magadha.

9. *Lāghulovāde musāvādaṃ adhigicya*, in the Aśokan edict called by Lévi that of Bhabra, now known as that of Calcutta-Bairāṭ, Hultzsch, Inscr. of Asoka, xxv, or of Bairāṭ Bhābrū, Mehendale, Hist. Gram. of Inscriptional Prakrits, Poona, 1948, ix: 'the admonition to Rāhula concerning falsehood' (referring to the text known in Pali as Sutta 61 of MN). *Lāghula* for *Rāhula* is quite unparalleled elsewhere; and *adhigicya* for Skt. *adhikṛtya* shows an apparently unique *cy* for *ty* (no other case in Mehendale).

vowel *u* may be suspected of responsibility for the change of *y* to *v*, a change which by the way is familiar in Pali (e.g. *āvuso*) and elsewhere. But *-āvo* for *-āyo* can hardly be due to assimilation to the following *o*. Dschi himself notes that interchange between *y* and *v* is widespread, if sporadic, from very ancient times. Cf. § 2.31; Vedic Variants II §§ 246 ff.; note the preference of the Taittirīya school for *v* as against *y* of other texts. There is no good reason for assigning the change of *y* to *v* to any one region. Such a change before a following *u*-vowel should be distinguished from that before other vowels.

1.29. Fifth, the form *hoti* for *bhavati*, which Dschi, following Michelson, calls a 'Māgadhism'. Michelson's only reason was that while *hoti* occurs in *all* Aśokan dialects, *bhoti* and *bhavati* occur only in western Aśokan. The form *hoti* (note that it is much rarer than *bhoti* in BHS! Chap. 43, s.v. *bhū* 2) is, of course, extremely common in Pali, and its equivalents are equally common in most Prakrits. It is general Middle Indic, and is obviously the form originally proper to enclitic use after vowels; intervocalic *bh* became *h*, e.g. in the instr. plur. ending *-hi* from *-bhi(s)* in all Aśokan dialects. The other form, *bhavati* or *bhoti*, persisted by the side of *hoti* in most, perhaps all, MIndic dialects; its popularity in some late forms of Pkt. may be due, in part, to Skt. influence. But it certainly persisted in Māgadhī and AMg. long after the time of Aśoka. According to Pischel 475 *bhavai* etc. is common in AMg.; the opt. *bhave* (1 sg. also *bhaveaṃ*) is the only opt. known in Mg., which also knows a present *bhavāmi* and other forms based on the stem *bhava-*. In view of all this, how is it possible to take *hoti* as a 'Māgadhism', simply because, in the Aśokan inscriptions, *bh-* forms happen to occur only in the west (along with *h*-forms, be it noted)? The evidence of later Mg. and AMg. shows that the absence of *bh*-forms in the few eastern Aśokan occurrences can only be accidental.

1.30. To me, the opinion of Lin Li-kouang (Aide-mémoire 227–8) seems much sounder. He asks:

> Is it probable, however, that the Buddhists ever used one sole language, even in the oldest times? Considering the pliant and liberal spirit which they always showed in regard to the use of languages, we may well ask whether there did not exist, from very early times [I would say, 'from the lifetime of the Buddha', as shown above], a multiplicity of Buddhist languages, Māgadhī being only one of them... Why not assume that other centers of ancient Buddhism, Vaiśālī, Kauśāmbī, Mathurā, Ujjayinī, and others, also had their own special dialects, which served as sacred languages for the communities established in these centers, according to the principle which the canonical texts expressly set down that Buddhist communities should adopt the local dialects?

1.31. Only this theory seems to me to account reasonably for the facts. The languages we know as Pali, BHS, and the Prakrit of the ms. Dutreuil de Rhins, all originated in such local dialects where Buddhist communities were settled. At least these three developed something approaching 'canons'. Many more such local canons may well have existed. A dim reflection of this condition may be seen in the early inscriptions treated by Lévi, l. c.[10]

1.32. Since in all such cases the 'canon' was originally brought by missionaries from outside, we should expect to find traces of 'foreign' dialects, in other words some dialect mixture, in any extensive canonical collection. So we do, in Pali and BHS. Since according to tradition the Buddha and many of his leading disciples were easterners, it is not strange that some sporadic forms in Pali seem, or have been assumed, to resemble Māgadhī, or Ardha-Māgadhī; but I think their importance has been exaggerated. There are a goodly number of Pali substitutions of *l* for older *r*, which is regular in Mg. but also found, at least occasionally, in many other dialects (Pischel 256–7), and even in Sanskrit. (The BHS occurrences of *l* for *r* are balanced by a substantial number of *r* for *l*. Standard Skt. shows this shift in both directions.) Otherwise there is in Pali the notorious but only very sporadic substitution of *e* for *o* (Skt. *as*; by morphological extension also for *am*). Similar, and equally sporadic, forms occur in BHS.[11] Other 'Prakritisms' in Pali, to the best of my knowledge, cannot be localized as to origin.

Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

1.33. As we saw, the most striking pecularity of this language is that from the very beginning of its tradition as we know it (that is, according to the mss. we have), and increasingly as time went on, it was modified in the direction of standard Sanskrit, while still retaining evidences of its Middle Indic origin. In all its texts, even the oldest, at least as shown by our manuscripts and editions, Sanskritisms are constantly presented cheek by jowl with Middle Indic forms, and often with hybrids which strictly are neither one nor the other. These Sanskritisms are much too common to be comparable with stray Sanskrit loanwords or loan-forms which may have been occasionally adopted in many a genuine Middle Indic vernacular.[12]

---

10. In later times (see Lin Li-kouang, op. cit., 176–187; 194–216) Tibetan traditions attribute to various Buddhist schools the use of 'Sanskrit' (which means BHS as Lin shows), and other Indic dialects (apparently meaning Prakrit, Apabhraṃśa, and Paiśācī). The historic meaning and value of these statements is doubtful, and in any case they are not directly relevant here. The Chinese traditions of Buddhist schools (op. cit. 188–194) seem to say nothing about their languages. (Corrections to Lin: p. 169, last line, *tajjakriyā* KP 105.8 = *tad-ja*°, not for Skt. *tarja*°; p. 199, *prayoya* Bbh 19.1 is certainly a mere misprint for *prayoga*.)

11. The ending *e*, instead of *o* (Skt. *as*) and *aṃ*, is now known to occur in other than eastern MIndic. First, extensively in the far west and northwest: in the Kharoṣṭhī Pkt. inscriptions (Konow, CII Vol. II pt. 1, see esp. cxii; Mehendale 314 n. 28: in certain districts *o* for masc. *a*-stems, *e* for nt.; west of the Indus, for the most part, *e* thruout); see also Burrow, Kharoṣṭhī Documents, § 12. Secondly, in the Prakrit inscriptions of Ceylon (Mehendale 134, note 61; Ep. Zeyl. I, 20.7, 62.2; *leṇe* 'cave', passim, = Skt. *layanam*, Pali and AMg. *leṇaṃ*); here too the evidence seems to indicate that *e* was the regular ending of masc. and nt. *a*-stems, n. and acc. sg. Furthermore, *e* for these same forms occurs in early Pkt. inscriptions found in every part of India, including west (Karle, Nasik: Mehendale 87–88), center (Meh. 172–173, e. g. Sanchi); and south (Meh. 135). In most of these regions, to be sure, *e* is not the favored or standard form; but this can be said just as truly of Pali or BHS. As in these languages, the inscriptional forms in *e* are no doubt largely due to dialect mixture. In the case of Pali and BHS, it may be that they are indeed borrowed from an eastern dialect. But the *e*-forms are so widespread in inscriptions that caution seems called for. They are not distinctive. As far as Pali is concerned, I do not know that it shows much, if anything, that is truly distinctive in common with Mg. or AMg. And this is certainly true of BHS.

12. A few examples (hundreds could easily be cited) of close juxtaposition of Skt. and MIndic forms in §§ 8.108,110. —Pali contains such borrowed Sanskrit words and forms, e. g. *vākya*, *ārogya*, *kva* (Geiger 53.3), and *brāhmaṇa* (and

1.34. Sinologists date Chinese translations of some BHS works as early as the 2d century A.D.; and these are not the earliest works in BHS, which must apparently be pre-Christian, by perhaps more than one century.[13] It seems, then, that in quite early times some north-Indian Buddhists abandoned their original principle of using genuine vernaculars, and partially yielded to the prestige of the classical and learned language of their brahman neighbors. Yet they made no effort to 'translate' into Sanskrit. BHS works, especially the oldest, retain in all parts clear evidences of being based on some form of Middle Indic, only partially, and it seems haphazardly, Sanskritized.

1.35. This mixture can, in my opinion, never have been spoken as a real vernacular. Yet it existed for centuries as a religious language, and seems to have become the prevalent language used by north-Indian Buddhists generally for religious purposes. At least, little else is preserved to us except some works in normal standard Sanskrit.

1.36. The extent of Sanskritization varies greatly in different periods, and even in different parts of some of the same works. Nearly all BHS works are composed in a mixture of prose and verse. In Mv (the Mahāvastu, see note 13), probably the earliest, the Sanskritization is relatively slight and imperfect, and all parts, both prose and verses, are affected by it to about the same extent.

1.37. In many other BHS texts (those of my second class, see Bibliography), e. g. in SP, LV, Gv, Suv, Samādh, the verses are presented in a relatively Middle Indic form, linguistically similar to the Mv; but the prose is far more Sanskritic in appearance, to such an extent that superficially, in its phonology and morphology, it looks like almost standard Sanskrit.[14] However, even the prose shows its Middle Indic base, first, by the fact that it occasionally shows non-Sanskrit forms; and secondly, by the fact that its vocabulary is just as Middle Indic as that of the verses. That is, it contains large numbers of words which never occur, or do not occur with the same meanings, in standard Sanskrit. They are words of the Buddhist, that is a Middle Indic, tradition, even tho they may appear in a Sanskritized garb. These words include, of course, many technical terms of the Buddhist religion, but the great majority are non-religious terms, words applicable in secular language. They stamp the language of the works containing them as based upon another dialect than Sanskrit.

1.38. Even the verses are written, in all our mss. and editions, in a partially Sanskritized manner. This applies to Mv (and to its prose parts) as well as to the verses of other texts. For example, consonant clusters which in all Middle Indic would be assimilated, or otherwise altered, are usually (tho not always) written as in Sanskrit. Word-final consonants which would be dropped in all Middle Indic are often written. But a careful study of the metrical structure of the verses has revealed the fact that in some respects, at least, this Sanskritized spelling is mere window-dressing, and misrepresents the actual pronunciation, which was Middle Indic. For example, a consonant cluster at the beginning of a word is proved by the meter to have been pronounced as a single consonant; e. g. a written *sthitaḥ* was pronounced *thi-*, or *ṭhi-*.[15] Internally, meter can give

---

its relatives); this last word is certainly a Skt. loan, as shown partly by the initial *br-* (which is not conclusive), but especially by the *ā* before a consonant cluster and the lack of metathesis in *hm* (cf. Geiger 49.1). Notorious is the Pali gerund suffix *-(i)tvā*, which must be a Skt. loan-form. Even Aśokan inscriptions, with the single exception of *-tpā* in the west (Girnar), show only *-tu*, and the only other record of *-tvā* elsewhere in Middle Indic (unless BHS be counted as such) seems to be the dialect of the 'Pkt. Dharmapada' (ms. Dutreuil de Rhins; e. g. ñatva, Senart p. 218; hitva p. 219). But the number of such words and forms is so limited in Pali that it is far from constituting a parallel to BHS. They are no more significant, as dialect mixture, than the so-called Māgadhisms of Pali, mentioned above.

13. According to Winternitz, Hist. Ind. Lit. II (1933). 247, the 'nucleus' of the Mahāvastu, which is commonly and I think rightly regarded as the oldest BHS work we have, 'originated as far back as the 2nd century B.C.', tho it was expanded later, some additions being as late as the 4th century A.D. and perhaps later yet. On stratification in Mv see references in fn. 21, to § 1.81. On classification, in part chronological, of BHS texts, see Bibliography.

14. No other fully preserved work is comparable with Mv in presenting its prose parts, as well as the verses, in a largely Middle Indic guise. We know, however, that there must have been others. In Śikṣ (154.17), which is largely a mosaic of quotations from older works, we find a prose passage cited from a lost work called Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka, and this prose is precisely like that of Mv, and radically different from the prose of any other work preserved to us. One ms. of Jm contains a short Jātaka story (printed in the Appendix to the Jm ed.) told in the same language and style, and perhaps borrowed directly from an older form of Mv, where it occurs (ii.244 f.); but the Jm insertion contains some passages not found in our mss. and the ed. of Mv, as well as many variants (in part mere corruptions).

15. See my article on 'Meter, Phonology, and Orthography in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit', JAOS 66.197 ff. This applies to texts preserved in older forms, the first and second classes listed with the Bibliography; not to the verses of the third class.

Professor Helmer Smith ('Les deux prosodies du vers bouddhique', K. Human. Vetensk. Lund 1949–1950, 1; Lund, 1950; 43 pp.) has honored my article on Meter etc., cited above, by a somewhat detailed critique. On a number of important points, I am glad to find, he agrees with me, notably on the purely orthographic and artificial character of initial consonant clusters in the writing (my §§ 15, 39 ff.). On the other hand, he is unwilling to accept many of my cases of syllable-lengthening m.c., especially by nasalization or consonant doubling. On p. 4, top, he expresses fear that I may mislead beginners by my use of the term 'm.c.' Of course I agree with him that such phenomena originated in genuine linguistic developments of doublet forms, each usable at will, and hence both used, according to metrical convenience. He seems, however (if I understand him), unwilling to grant that once such doublets existed in certain categories, analogy could operate to create similar doublets where historically they 'ought' not to exist. To me it seems impossible to doubt the reality of such analogical extensions, many instances of which are used in BHS only in verses where they fit the meter, and where the 'regular' form would not fit. The term 'm.c.' seems therefore appropriate to them. See table of abbreviations for my use of 'm.c.'.

One of the two ways in which he seeks to avoid acceptance of my interpretations in this category is to explain otherwise the individual cases mentioned in my article. In reply, I would note, first, that in the JAOS article I cited only a very few examples. Many more are cited in this grammar, but even here my lists are by no means exhaustive. The cumulative weight of the great mass of materials seems to me to make fruitless such efforts to explain some of them away, by pluralistic, and

no evidence on this particular matter; Skt. *ucyate* and MIndic (*v*)*uccati* would fit the meter equally well. But since (*v*)*uccati* is actually written fairly often, we may reasonably suspect the real linguistic value of orthographic *ucyate*. And if the verses were demonstrably pronounced, in large part at least, in a thoroughly Middle Indic way, despite partially Sanskritized spelling, is it not at least a plausible guess that the accompanying prose of the same works may have been pronounced similarly, despite much more extensive orthographic Sanskritization?[16]

Changes in the course of tradition

1.39. There is evidence to show that, morphologically as well as orthographically speaking, BHS texts have undergone increasing adaptation to Sanskrit norms in the course of handing down by tradition.

1.40. This is particularly clear when, as is true in a number of cases, we have different forms of the same text. Most complete texts of extensive works are known to us only from Nepalese and Japanese mss. But some are preserved in other regions; and particularly in Chinese Turkestan, old fragments have come to light of parts of some of the same works known more completely in Nepalese or other later recensions. It was pointed out notably by Lüders (see fn. 16) that the fragments of the 'Kashgar' (Chinese Turkestan) recension of SP show many differences from the Nepalese recension, a fact sufficiently clear even from the critical notes to the very unsatisfactory Kern-Nanjio edition. Lüders emphasizes that this is as true of the prose as of the verses, and that the Kashgar form of the prose often contains Prakritisms, while the Nepalese has Sanskritized the forms (e. g. *bhāṣiṃsu*: *abhāṣanta*); tho at times the reverse relation exists, so that we must assume some Sanskritization in both recensions, and an original more Middle Indic than either. Lüders is undoubtedly right in taking it for granted that Middle Indic or non-Sanskrit words and forms, in whatever recension they

---

sometimes forced or even impossible, explanations. Let me cite a single instance (p. 4): 'que, seul, *mīḍhaṃ-gilī* (ɔ: *-gilān* Pāṇ 6.3.70), épithète des *prāṇaka*, donnerait un sens à [LV] 197.3'. I think Professor Smith, had he investigated this passage with his usual care and acumen, would not have made this statement. In this LV verse, the Bodhisattva has three dreams about himself; in pāda a, four black and white animals (*prāṇaka* has this meaning here, not 'insects' as Mr. Smith may possibly take it, and as it may be used) lick his feet; in pāda b, four-colored birds come to him and 'become one-colored' (read *bhuta* = *bhūta*, with Tibetan, instead of *-dbhuta*); in c–d, he walks on 'mountains of dung' without being soiled. Instead of 'mountains of dung', Mr. Smith would have 'dung-swallowing' (animals, or insects). But: (1) between the *prāṇaka* of pāda a, and pāda c, intervenes pāda b, with the unrelated 'birds'; Smith's syntax seems to me impossible. (2) Tib. reads *ri* 'mountain(s)', for *-girī*. (3) In Mv ii.137.3 ff. the same three dreams are recorded, in the same order, and in line 11 *mīḍha-parvatasya* disproves Smith's emendation of LV. (4) To me, at least, it is of some interest that 'A' (on the whole perhaps the best ms. of LV) is cited by Lefmann as *mīḍhagbhirī*, i. e. *mīḍhaggirī*; this may be the true reading; it tends to support my view of the equivalence of nasalization and doubling of consonants as means of metrical lengthening; Smith's emendation could not deal with it.—This case shows how even the greatest of scholars may go astray on an individual case. It consoles me, a little, for the (at least) two errors which Smith's sharp eyes detected in my work; he is quite right (pp. 2–3) on Mv i.70.17 and Laṅk 268.15, which should be deleted from my §§ 72, 71. I can only express gratitude to him, and chagrin at my own carelessness. (As to *matīnāṃ*, printed in my § 75 for *matīmāṃ*, it was not an 'emendation', as Smith p. 9 naturally supposed, but—I hope—a mere misprint; or else a slip in copying. I am much less inclined to accept most of Smith's other 'corrections' or variant interpretations of passages treated in my work.)

I cannot here deal at length with Mr. Smith's more general considerations. He relies extensively on Pali metrics, and even to some extent on Vedic. I frankly have never understood Pali meter, as a whole. (I hope and expect to profit from Prof. Smith's studies, based on his vast knowledge of Pali, which infinitely surpasses my own.) At certain points I have noted resemblances to BHS, but a great many Pali verses baffle me; they seem to involve principles which I am unable to formulate, but which in any case seem to me, for the present at least, and even after reading Smith, quite different from any in BHS. As to Vedic meter, BHS seems to me radically different in fundamental principles, and I think it dangerous to interpret the latter by the former. BHS meter, in fact, seems to me in some important respects quite individual, despite, of course, many points of resemblance to Pali and Classical Skt. meters. At least provisionally, and at first, I believe it should be studied by itself.

Such study is complicated. First, the text tradition of most BHS texts is wretched. Corruptions abound everywhere, notably in Mv, and (probably near the other end of the chronological scale) in such a text as Mmk. We must collect, for each text, forms, and metrical patterns too, which are attested by considerable amounts of evidence; having done that, we may, cautiously, suggest that apparent deviations may be text-corruptions. In Mv I have found a very considerable number of cases which agree with the metrical principles I have set up. In view of the known frightful corruption of the mss., I think we may apply the above principle to seeming exceptions. On the whole I am inclined to treat Mmk in the same way. But there are some texts of my class 3 (see the introduction to my Bibliography) where I still hesitate, because of the lack (in their mss.) of a compelling number of cases supporting my formulas. (Divy is an example.) Some of these Class 3 texts may belong, metrically, to a developed, or broken-down, system of metrics, compared to the texts of Classes 1 and 2. In footnote 21 to § 1.81 I call attention to some stanzas inserted very late in the Nepalese version of SP which are metrically very aberrant, and which I cannot analyze satisfactorily. In principle, therefore, I am not averse to recognizing different 'prosodies' in BHS texts as we have them. So far, I remain unconvinced by Professor Smith's particular views as regards types of BHS prosody. There is not room in this already swollen publication to discuss them in detail, nor have I as yet had time to give sufficient study to his (I am sure, very valuable and important) studies in Pali metrics.

16. In Hoernle, Ms. Remains, 161 f., Lüders wrote: 'I am even inclined to believe that the original (sc. of SP) was written in a pure Prakrit dialect which was afterwards gradually put into Sanskrit.' (Cf. the next paragraphs. SP is in no way distinctive among BHS works.) If Lüders had been aware of the above evidence, perhaps he would have been ready to consider with me the possibility that the 'putting into Sanskrit' was in part purely orthographic. I think, however, that Lüders was quite wrong in indentifying the 'original dialect' as Māgadhī, solely on the ground of vocatives in *-āho*; these are not exclusively Mg. (§ 8.88).

occur, are invariably older than corresponding Sanskritizations in other versions.

1.41. Similar results are shown by a comparison of the Central Asiatic fragments of Vaj published by Pargiter (Hoernle, MR 176 ff.), compared with Müller's ed. of Vaj (from Japanese sources). Examples, all prose (first Pargiter, then Müller's ed.): *parinditāḥ* . . . *parindanayā* 179.3, *parīn°* (even in this form the word is not Sanskrit!) 20.4, 5; *pratiṣṭhihitvā* 180.12, *pratiṣṭhitena* 21.9; *pratiṣṭhihe* (3 sg. opt.) 180.14, *pratitiṣṭhet* 21.11; *viyūbha* 180.16, 188.20, *viyūha* 188.19, for *vyūha* 27.4, 38.6, 7; *u(d)graheṣyanti* 186.8, 22, and 187.9, *udgrahīṣyanti* 33.17, 34.14, 35.5; *babhūva* with 3 pl. subject 187.6, *abhūvan* 35.1; *carimikāyām paścimikāyā(ṃ)* 187.8, *paścimāyāṃ* (omitting *cari°*) 35.4. In all these the Central Asiatic version is more Middle Indic, Müller's text Sanskritized and so presumably secondary. But the contrary is the case with *ārādhitā* and *virādhitā* 187.7, instead of *ārāgitā*, *virāgitā* 35.3.

1.42. It has sometimes been suggested that the verses retain in most texts a more Middle Indic appearance than the prose because the meter made it harder to Sanskritize them. I should not venture to deny that this consideration may have had some weight. Perhaps the greater aura of distinction, secular or religious, which has usually attached to verses in India, may also have been concerned. (The verses alone of the Pali Jātaka are canonical; the prose is mere 'commentary'.) I would, however, point out that we have definite proof that the BHS verses, too, were not exempt from changes in tradition. Chakravarti's edition of Ud cites the text of one ancient and fragmentary ms. (provenience not stated) and of several later ones, mostly, it seems, from Chinese Turkestan. I shall record here a selection of the variants. They are interesting as showing that meter was not really a serious obstacle to change. By patching the meter (often with insertion of a 'patchword', *Flickwort*), by rearranging the order of words, or otherwise, a new form, Sanskrit or nearer to it, may replace a more Middle Indic one. If anything really important had depended on it, later redactors could probably have made the verses of SP, for example, look as Sanskritic as the accompanying prose. Indeed, this is just what happened in the BHS works of my third class (see Bibliography). In the forms in which they are preserved to us, their verses (so far as they have any; Divy, for example, has a good many) seem as Sanskritized as the prose. Furthermore, some Middle Indic forms could have been Sanskritized very easily without affecting the meter. Thus the Skt. 3 sg. optative ending *-et* is metrically equivalent to Middle Indic *-e*. Yet the latter is extensively retained in the verses of most texts of the first and second classes, while the prose almost always has *-et*, if we may trust the mss. and editions (except in Mv; even in Mv *-e* is much commoner in verses than in prose).—When the same verse is known to exist in Pali, it is sometimes interesting to compare the Pali equivalents of the words cited; this will be done occasionally, tho by no means invariably, in the following list. I cite first the readings of the oldest ms., then of the later ones, which are invariably secondary.

1.43. Earlier and later forms in ms. readings of verses of Ud.

viii.12 *bhāṣeya, vihinseya*: *bhāṣeta, vihiṃseta*. Pali *bhāseyya, vihiṃseyya*.
ix.3 *bhāyasi*: *bibheṣi*.
x.5 *śraddhāya* (instr.): *śraddhayā*.
x.6 *cchindati*: *chinatti*.
xi.2 *parākkrame*: *parākramet*.
xi.3 *saṃkiliṣṭā* (read °*ṭaṃ*?) *va* (m.c. for *vā*) *yas* (read *yat*) *tapaḥ*: *saṃkliṣṭaṃ vāpi* (note patchword!) *yat tapaḥ*.
xi.7 *careya*: *carate*; *saṃkalpānaṃ* (gen. pl.): °*nāṃ*.
xi.10 *sālaṃ vā māluvotata* (= *māluvā-otataṃ*, for *avatataṃ*): *sālaṃ vā māluvā yathā*. Pali *māluvā sālam ivotataṃ*.
xi.11 *sthero*: *sthaviro* (which here is unmetrical, even in the later ms. which writes it; its writer doubtless read it *sthero* (if not *thero*), the 'Skt.' form being purely orthographic).
xii.3 *yāya* (instr.): *yayā*.
xii.4 *mārgānāṣṭāṅgikaḥ* (i. e. *mārgāṇa*, gen. pl., *aṣṭ°*) *śreṣṭhaḥ satyānaṃ cature padāḥ*: *mārgeṣv aṣṭāṅgikaḥ śreṣṭhaś catvāry āryāṇi satyataḥ*. Pali *maggān' aṭṭhaṅgiko seṭṭho saccānaṃ caturo padā*, supporting the prior reading, all the forms of which are paralleled in BHS. Chakravarti's emendations are all false.
xii.5 *yadā prajñāya* (instr.) *paśyati*: *prajñayā paśyate yadā* (order changed to accommodate Sktized form to the meter).
xv.7 *ye suptāḥ pratibuddhatha* (impv.): *suptāś ca pratibudhyataḥ* (read °*ta*; stem and ending both Sktized).
xvi.4 *-darśāvī* (n. pl.): *-darśino*.
xvi.5 *sa imāṃ* (acc. pl.) *bhāsate loke* (acc. pl.): *sa imaṃ* (one fragment *imāṃ*!) *bhāsate lokaṃ*. Pali *so (i)maṃ lokaṃ pabhāseti* (more nearly agreeing with the later version of Ud; the older version of Ud is probably older than the Pali).
xvi.5, 7, 9 *abhramukto va* (= *iva*): *abhramuktaiva* (v.l. °*kta iva*, unmetr.). Pali *abbhā mutto va*.
xvi.14 *iccheya*: *icched*.
xviii.3 *chindatha, bhavatha* (impvs.): *chindata, bhavata*.
xviii.5 *paduma, vṛṃhaye*: *padmaṃ, bṛṃhayet*.
xviii.11 *(vyatiro)cati prajñāya* (instr.): *prajñayā vyatiroca(n)te*.
xviii.13 *vipramuñcatha* (impv.): °*ta*.
xviii.18 *prapuṣpa(kāṇi)*: *tu puṣpakāṇi* (so). Pali *papupphakāni*.
xix.5 *hirīniṣevī*: *hrīniṣevī hi* (patchword). Pali *hirīnisedho*.
xix.12 *bhadraṃ va*: *bhadram iva* (unmetr.).
xx.1 *viprajaheya*: *viprajahec ca* (patchword). Pali *vippajaheyya*.
xx.2 *prajahe*: °*hed*.
xx.5 *ahirī*: *ahrīko*.

1.44. At least equally interesting are parallel passages in different works, sometimes paralleled also in the Pali canon, and in that case presumably going back to extremely early Buddhist tradition. In the statement of the first of the Four Noble Truths, presumed to contain the Buddha's own words, Mv iii.332.4 has the adverbial instr. *saṃkṣiptena*, 'in brief, in a word', not recorded in Skt., but = Pali (Vin. i.10.29 = SN v.421.23) *saṃkhittena*, while the LV version, 417.7, substitutes the regular Skt. *saṃkṣepāt*. In another prose passage Mv ii.283.14 reads *purime yāme* 'in the first night-watch', but the LV correspondent (344.7) reads *prathame yāme*. The word *purima* is not Skt., and is used by LV only in verses, never in prose, according to our mss. Yet in such a passage as this, one cannot help wondering if the obviously secondary *prathame* was not introduced by some relatively late redactor or copyist; in short, whether the original LV text did not read *purime*.

1.45. Even in a verse, LV 387.18 substitutes *pūrvikāṃ* for Mv iii.305.19 *purimāṃ*, here meaning 'eastern', a rather rare use of *purima* in BHS, and nowhere found in LV, I believe. In verses, Mv iii.306.6 *purastime* 'eastern' = LV 388.8 *pūrvasmin vai* (note the patchword, m.c.); Mv iii.309.8 *Pṛthivī Padumāvatī* = LV 391.3 *Pṛthvī Padmāvatī tathā* (two epenthetic vowels removed, meter again mended by a patchword).

1.46. In general, LV (at least as preserved to us) is secondary and Sanskritizing compared to Mv, in passages

which the two texts have in common. Yet it would be wrong to assume that this is universally true. Each case is a separate problem. Neither text borrowed directly from the other; both incorporated materials that were older than either, and sometimes LV seems to have preserved features which more closely resemble the common original than any parallel version, including Pali versions. In the prose account of the Buddha's first sermon at Benares occurs a passage in which he tells his audience, the five monks who had formerly been his followers, how he first realized that he had reached enlightenment: LV 418.13 ff., Mv iii.333.11 ff., and Pali Vin. i.11.18 ff. = SN v.422.31 ff. The two Pali versions are identical, verbatim; the two BHS versions, closely resembling the Pali in essence, diverge from it and from each other in many details, sometimes one, sometimes the other being closer to the Pali. In the first sentence, LV *eṣu catuṣv* (so all mss.; note the MIndic form, for Skt. *caturṣu*, in LV prose!) *āryasatyeṣu* = Pali *imesu catusu ariyasaccesu*, but Mv (changing construction) *imāni catvāry āryasatyāni*. There are many interesting things which a detailed study of the three versions reveals. I shall mention only the verb-form *pratijñāsiṣaṃ*, LV 418.15 and 19, an unaugmented aorist. In 15 all mss. lack the augment; in 19 only a few inferior mss. have it. This is a non-Skt. feature, and therefore likely to go back to the oldest times. Yet Pali has an augmented form, *paccaññāsiṃ*, both times. Mv substitutes a present, *pratijāne 'haṃ* the first time, and *prajānāmi* (perhaps read *pratijānāmi*?) the second time; in lines 12 and 15 it has *abhyajñāsiṣaṃ* (augmented) in a clause which is differently expressed in LV and the Pali.

1.47. I know of no Pali correspondent to the Avalokita (Mv), or (in Śikṣ) Avalokana (or °nā), Sūtra which is reproduced at length in Mv ii.293.16–397.7 (following another similar text with the same title). But many of its stanzas are cited in Śikṣ 297.10–308.12, and a few others 89.15–90.3. The Śikṣ extract is only a small selection, yet includes some verses not found in Mv; for this and other reasons it is certain that Śikṣ was not citing from Mv; rather, both cite from a common ultimate original. Most of the verses common to the two texts are composed in a sama-vṛtta meter known to me otherwise only from LV 229.21–234.10; each of the four pādas has the scheme ⏓ — ⏑ — — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ — ×. Both Śikṣ and Mv, especially the latter, are very corrupt in this passage. A combination of the two, with the help of the meter, sometimes makes possible a restoration superior to both. (Omitting two of the four shorts which follow the fifth syllable produces a normal BHS triṣṭubh pāda; and this is often the result of textual corruptions, especially in Mv.)

1.48. In these verses, apart from corruptions, the Mv readings are in general more un-Sanskritic, and hence closer to the original, than those of Śikṣ. Many scores of examples would show this; one is *phalikha-bhujo*, to be read with mss. (except that they have °*khaṃ*-) Mv ii.379.5, 'with arms like bars' (see Dict. s.v. *phalikha*), for which Śikṣ 303.3 has the normal Skt. *parigha-bhujo*. Nevertheless, Śikṣ is sometimes non-Skt. and clearly original, or closer to it, and Mv Sanskritized and secondary. Examples are: *yatha-r-iva* Śikṣ 304.10, *yatha* Mv ii.383.5 (in meter, also, secondary); *kavacita lakṣaṇebhiḥ* Śikṣ 304.16, *varalakṣitāṅgo* Mv 386.10 (in meter, also, secondary); *pithita* Śikṣ 307.3, (*a*)*pihitā* Mv 393.6; *sthita bhonti* Śikṣ 307.15, *nivasanti* Mv 394.19 (but here both are metrically secondary, lacking two short syllables); *saṃpramuñcī* (aor., or possibly opt.) Śikṣ 308.12, *so pramuñced* Mv 395.23.

1.49. We might go much farther in citing such examples, but I trust that these are enough. Let me summarize the facts about BHS as stated so far.

1.50. (1) Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit tradition, as a whole, starts from, or goes back to, an early Buddhist canon, or quasi-canon, which was composed not in Sanskrit but in a Middle Indic vernacular which very probably already contained dialect mixture.

1.51. (2) Some parts of this old canon, or passages from it, are preserved in BHS, sometimes in more than one form. When this is the case, any non-Sanskrit features of form and vocabulary, wherever recorded, are always closer to the original on which they are based than corresponding standard Sanskrit features, wherever recorded.

1.52. (3) The verses of BHS texts of my classes 1 and 2, as presented in our mss., are on the whole semi-Middle-Indic or hybridized. This means that they represent the BHS tradition in its purest form. In texts of class 2, the accompanying prose parts of these texts are nearly (not quite) Sanskritized in phonology and morphology, according to the mss. In vocabulary, the prose is just as Middle Indic as the verses.

1.53. (4) In all BHS works, as presented in our mss. and editions, there are very many words and forms which are standard Sanskrit. These include many forms which cannot possibly have existed, at any time, in any Middle Indic dialect. They represent alterations in the tradition, later in time than the original Middle Indic canon, at least (not necessarily later than the composition of the specific BHS works in which they are recorded). As time went on, the tendency was in general towards ever increasing Sanskritization. Yet the BHS tradition continued to live, apparently for centuries, as a religious language among the Buddhists, or at least some Buddhists, of North India. The hallmark which distinguishes it is the vocabulary, which contains not only technical religious terms, but quantities of purely secular words, which never occur in standard Sanskrit. Very rarely can any serious doubt arise as to whether a particular work should be classed as BHS. Even if its grammar is virtually Sanskrit, or entirely so (tho such a case hardly occurs), its vocabulary will decide.[17]

1.54. (5) There is clear evidence that some of these Sanskrit words and forms were substituted for older, non-Sanskrit ones, by later copyists or redactors of the individual work containing them: in other words, that some such works were originally more Middle Indic than is indicated by some, or even all, of the mss. in which they are preserved to us. In SP for example, one recension Sanskritizes some words, another recension others; the original text of SP must have been less Sanskritic than either.

1.55. (6) There is, further, evidence that in citing or incorporating older materials, any BHS text (if we accept the evidence of its mss.) may be expected to have introduced some Sanskritizations of originally Middle Indic features.

1.56. (7) It is, however, certain that some Sanskrit-appearing features are orthographic only; the words were pronounced as in Middle Indic. This is proved by the metrical structure of the verses of BHS texts of classes 1 and 2. How old this misleading Sanskritic spelling is, we have no way of telling; it appears very commonly, tho

---

17. Among the works treated by me, at most Jm might possibly be questioned. It may be a borderline case, but seems to me to have enough characteristic BHS vocabulary to justify inclusion. It certainly has few traces of Middle Indic morphology. Cf. however, the gerund *aḍhiśrāya* Jm 35.5 (§ 35.20); the pples. (*an*-)*āstarita* 220.14 and (*Aṅga*-)*dinna* 192.12; *sātmy eva bhavanti* 95.9 (= *sātmībhavanty eva*); and the characteristic BHS and Pali locution *teṣāṃ . . . etad abhūt* 41.23.

not invariably, in the mss. of all the specified texts. That the same was true of the same or similar features in the accompanying prose, at least in earlier times, seems a reasonable guess; naturally, there can be no direct proof that the prose was pronounced otherwise than as written.

Plan and methods of this work

1.57. I trust that the preceding statements will justify a procedure adopted in this work, which at first sight may seem surprising. *In principle, I have excluded from my grammar and dictionary all forms which are standard Sanskrit, and all words which are used in standard Sanskrit with the same meanings.*[18]

1.58. My work is therefore to this extent incomplete. For certainly some words and some forms were common to the original dialect, as to all Middle Indic dialects, on the one hand, and to Sanskrit on the other. But there is no way of distinguishing such items from late intrusions put in by secondary redactors, copyists, or even modern editors; nor is there any general, objective, and reliable way of distinguishing those words which are Sanskrit in spelling only and were pronounced in Middle Indic fashion. To have included all words and forms presented in Sanskrit guise would have padded the work and, what is more important, obscured the picture. And it is impossible to draw any line objectively. It was a question of all or none.

1.59. What I have tried to do, then, is to collect and classify the non-Sanskrit forms and words, only, which are contained in BHS. It seems to me that this is what has always been needed; and no attempt has previously been made to supply it.

1.60. My work is based on available printed texts. A few of the editors have provided critical apparatuses giving the readings of their mss., or some of them (see §§ 1.73–75). These are especially valuable and have been constantly utilized in my work. They demonstrate that even the best editors did not know how to handle the language, for lack of any standard to go by. How can an editor be sure whether a non-Sanskrit word or form found in his manuscripts is just a copyist's error, or represents (accurately or inaccurately) a real form of the language? It was necessary to collect the evidence from all, or nearly all,[19] the published texts, and to classify and systematize the grammar and lexicon. Only then could editors know how to proceed. No existing printed text of any work in this dialect is satisfactory, or indeed could be, without such a work as I have tried to provide. The editors should not be blamed; theirs was an impossible task. Even the best of them print false emendations on almost every page; the worst, we may fear, do the same thing without acknowledging it.

1.61. It is, of course, true that my rule of excluding standard Skt. forms and words is not always easy to apply. Just what is 'standard Sanskrit'? *I have tried to include*, rather than exclude, *doubtful cases*, indicating the reason for my doubt. Exclusively Vedic words and forms are not 'Sanskrit'; but it is rarely necessary to consider them, since they hardly ever concern BHS. The Mahābhārata is another matter. It contains definite Middle-Indicisms; and I have thought best, for example, to mention in my Synopsis of Verb Forms (Chap. 43) the thematic present *dadati*, 'he gives', and forms of its type, which are not rare in the Epic and occur in the Veda. In the Dictionary, I occasionally include in *parentheses* a word which seems to be used in standard Skt. in virtually the same way as in BHS, and yet to deserve inclusion for some reason. Compound nouns paralleled in Pali, and not recorded in Skt., I have tried to include, even when the parts are normal Skt. and the meaning of the compound is easily and simply derived from the meaning of its parts. Words and meanings recorded only by Sanskrit grammarians and lexicographers, or perhaps also once or twice in late and artificial literature, are generally treated as BHS. The extent and nature of the Skt. records about them are included with the definitions.

1.62. Naturally, the two great dictionaries of Boehtlingk (and Roth) have been my main reliance for Sanskrit. Schmidt's Nachträge have also been constantly consulted, and occasionally I have found a Skt. word elsewhere; in such cases the word has been included in my Dictionary, at least in parentheses, with a reference to its Skt. occurrence.

1.63. Pali correspondents, when I have found any, are always cited in the Dictionary (cf. § 1.106). If no reference is given, the Pali word will be found in its alphabetical position either in the Copenhagen Dictionary, Volume I, or otherwise in the Pali Text Society's Dictionary. If I know no correspondent in Pali, but have found one in Ardha-Māgadhī, this is cited, from Ratnachandra's Dictionary (without reference), or Sheth. If no Pali or AMg. correspondent is found, I cite (from Sheth, if no reference is given) any Prakrit equivalent found, or any from the Aśokan or other inscriptions, from the Deśīnāmamālā, or from Apabhraṃśa, or occasionally from a modern Indo-Aryan language. If no correspondent is cited, none is known to me.

1.64. As stated above, my work is primarily based on the printed texts of BHS works listed in the Bibliography, with such critical apparatuses as are provided therein. I have had no direct access to manuscripts. To have tried to use them systematically would have meant, in effect, reediting the texts. New editions are unquestionably needed of most of them, and I trust that my work will facilitate the labors of future editors. But if I had tried to do this task myself, the fifteen years or so which I have given to this work would have been indefinitely extended, and I should certainly not have lived to finish it.

1.65. In general, the dictionary cites nouns, adjectives, and pronouns by stem form, verbs by third person singular present. For purposes of general reference, the grammar also uses these forms, but in the case of verbs it also often uses the 'root' in accordance with the common Sanskrit convention.

1.66. Specific forms cited from any text are in general intended to reproduce the exact spelling of the text cited, unless the contrary is stated, except that when the inflectional form is deemed unimportant, the bare stem alone may be cited. The chief further exception concerns alternative spellings, which vary at random, with either anusvāra or a nasal consonant before another consonant. This seems to be a purely orthographic matter, and as a rule not worth recording. Such writings as final *-āṃ* and *-ān* are probably of no more significance. See on this whole subject §§ 2.65–67.

1.67. Often I adopt a reading stated to be that of all mss., which an editor emended (in my opinion wrongly).

---

18. Technical terms of Buddhist religion, and proper names, belonging exclusively to Buddhist stories, are of course included in the dictionary, even tho they occur in *Buddhist* works which are composed in standard Sanskrit (§ 1.2). This constitutes no real exception to the above principle.

19. A few works have been used only partially, or not at all, because they appeared in print, or became accessible to me, only after my work was nearing completion; or because they seemed to me of minor importance.

In such cases I sometimes write '(mss.)' or '(so mss.)' after the form in question, not always citing the emendation which the editor put into the text. In the case of the ending *-etsu(ḥ)*, 3 pl. aor. or opt., which occurs many hundreds of times in Mv and is invariably replaced by *-ensu(ḥ)* in Senart's text (§ 1.88), I cite the reading of the mss. without calling attention to Senart's emendations individually. What seem to me clearly misprints (and, of course, still more what I believe are copyist's errors) are corrected, but (I hope) always with indication of the fact, if only by a phrase like '(so read)', and oftener with quotation of the text as actually printed.

1.68. I need hardly say that I have read with care all the texts on which my work is based (with the qualifications noted under certain works in the Bibliography), tried to understand them, and noted all words and forms which seemed not to be standard Sanskrit. Naturally, in the case of the commoner words and forms, only samples could be included in the dictionary and grammar, but I have tried to make them typical and abundant enough to give an approximate notion of what the totality would show.

1.69. Unfortunately, the state of most of the textual tradition is deplorable. While many passages, and consequently many words and forms, have become clear as a direct result of my collection and collation, I am only too well aware that many textual and exegetic problems have remained unsolved. To help future investigators, I have tried to include all dubious words and forms as far as possible. It is unfortunately not always possible to do so; very often the true - ord-division depends on the interpretation, and cannot be established in default of the latter.

1.70. Parallel passages in BHS itself are, of course, the most important aids to interpretation, as in all philological work. Next come parallel passages in Pali, which often contains close equivalents of BHS verses or prose passages, and still oftener phrases and locutions which correspond to those of BHS. The Copenhagen ('Critical') Pali Dictionary has proved extremely valuable in helping me to discover them. If that monumental and magnificent work of scholarship had progressed further than the first volume, I should doubtless have found more than I have. The other Pali dictionaries are much less useful.

1.71. Tibetan translations, so far as available, are extremely helpful. Their notorious literalness usually makes possible a confident decision as to what their BHS originals read, and how the translators understood it. Unfortunately I had access, while the work was in progress, to Tibetan versions of only a few of the BHS texts. After the work was completed, Yale University acquired a set of the Kanjur (Lhasa ed.), as a gift from His Holiness the Dalai Lama; but this arrived too late to be useful to me.

1.72. I know no Chinese, and so have had to depend on others for such help as I have been able to get from Chinese Buddhist works. Finot, for example, furnishes a very helpful French translation (by Huber) of the Chinese version of Prāt. Various kind colleagues, present and past, Sinologists and Japanologists, have given me valuable help, especially in interpreting the Chinese and Japanese equivalents of the BHS and Tibetan entries contained in Mvy; occasionally also in dealing with other works.

1.73. Perhaps the most difficult and corrupt, as also probably the oldest and most important, of all BHS works is the Mahāvastu. So far as is yet known, no translation of it exists in either Tibetan or Chinese.[20] It was edited by Émile Senart in three stout volumes, 1882–1897. Senart's extensive notes often let the reader perceive the despair which constantly threatened to overwhelm him. It must be remembered that around 1880 comparatively few Pali texts had been published; even by 1897 many were still inaccessible; and as to BHS, few texts had been edited in Senart's day, and those few badly. Confronted with the many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of corruptions in Mv, Senart had little choice except to let them stand as the manuscripts present them, or to try to rewrite them himself. He did sometimes one, sometimes the other. It goes without saying that in a great many cases his emendations were successful; for he was a very great scholar. And yet, as is generally the case when an editor attempts a vast number of emendations, many of Senart's have not proved sound. We must, however, acknowledge with the utmost gratitude and appreciation the meticulous care with which he recorded the actual readings of his six mss. as far as i.193.12, and thereafter of two typical ones. With the far more extensive aids now available, Senart's careful and scholarly critical apparatus has enabled me to recognize as correct many readings of his mss. which he rejected; and I fully believe that many others will be recognized by my better-informed or more perceptive successors.

1.74. Johannes Nobel has edited Suv with equally praiseworthy care, and also published its Tibetan translation. The fragments in Hoernle's MR are all admirably edited. There are other able and sound editions. Lefmann's edition of the important LV seems to be quite meticulous in giving the readings of his rather numerous mss., which makes his work very valuable, even tho his editorial judgment in constituting the text cannot be rated very highly. On the other hand, the Kern-Nanjio edition of SP, which is also a text of prime importance, tho it professes to cite the readings of a number of mss., is sadly unreliable (see W. Baruch, Beiträge zum Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Leiden, 1938, pp. 7–12). And the later edition of SP by Wogihara and Tsuchida has little value; for example it constantly repeats, without note or comment, indefensible emendations of the KN text.

1.75. Still less helpful are the texts, printed usually in the orient, which do not even try to record the readings of the mss., or do so only very sporadically and unsystematically. Many of them are obviously printed very badly, with numerous misprints, which at times are not easy to distinguish from scribal errors of the underlying mss. Yet I have hesitated to refuse to use a printed text on such grounds alone; some of them contain important materials. I have, to be sure, tried to exercise restraint and caution in relying on the evidence of such texts, of which the edition of Mmk is a rather extreme example.

---

20. To the kindness of my colleague Professor Johannes Rahder I owe the following note. A Japanese work called Bombun-butsuden-bungaku no Kenkyū (Studies in Sanskrit biographies of Buddha), by Taiken Kimura (died 1930) and (his pupil) Tsūshō Byōdō (799 pp., Tokyo 1930), deals extensively with the Mahāvastu on pp. 565–668. Particularly noteworthy is a comparison of the contents of Mv i and ii (vol. iii is not treated only 'for lack of time', not because of lack of parallels) with the contents, especially, of the Chinese *Fo-pên-hsing-chi-ching* (not later than the end of the 6th century). This work seems to follow rather closely the outline of Mv, omitting a great deal, much of which is suspected on other grounds of having been added to Mv in late times. Byōdō believes that it is either a translation of an older version of Mv, or that both it and Mv were based on an older Indian work. Fuller knowledge may possibly compel us to qualify the usual statement that the Mv was 'never translated into Chinese' (so e. g. Lin Li-kouang, L'Aide-mémoire, 174).

Sanskrit versus Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

1.76. Many scholars, even down to the present day, refer to BHS simply as 'Sanskrit'. Louis Renou, in his excellent Grammaire Sanscrite, includes (e. g. on p. 350) references to some, tho relatively very few, forms of BHS; on p. i he notes that 'on a été à la frontière du sanscrit en signalant les faits de langue mixte représentés par le Mahāvastu et le Lalitavistara'. Of course all have recognized that, if this language is 'Sanskrit', it is a peculiar kind. But there are other peculiar kinds of what is still usually called 'Sanskrit'. The language of the Mahābhārata, for instance, contains Middle-Indicisms; yet few would hesitate to describe it as fundamentally a kind of 'Sanskrit' (tho it does not follow Pāṇini very closely).

1.77. The great lexicographer Boehtlingk included in BR and pw many BHS words (especially from LV, Kv, Mvy, Vaj, Divy, and Jm). But in the preface to the last volume of pw, Boehtlingk refers to such BHS words as 'hardly to be called Sanskrit'. The publication date of this volume was 1889; that of the first volume of Senart's Mahāvastu was 1882. Yet Boehtlingk never mentions Mv, and does not cite a single word from it. Had he not seen Senart's publication before finishing his work on the pw? If he had seen it, and deliberately ignored it, I should have expected him to state his reasons for doing so. He could, in my opinion, have given very good reasons. If the rest of BHS literature were like Mv, in presenting prose as well as verses in Middle Indic or hybrid forms, I can hardly believe it would ever have been called Sanskrit, or that its vocabulary would have been included in Sanskrit dictionaries. One might as well include Pali and Prakrit words in a Sanskrit dictionary. I believe it is a fact, and if so it is significant, that nearly all BHS words included in BR and pw are taken from the prose, not the verses, of such works as LV. The form of this prose is such that it is easy to mistake it for Sanskrit. In my opinion, however, it all belongs to a different linguistic tradition, and should be excluded from works professing to deal with Sanskrit.

The Prakrit underlying BHS

1.78. Various attempts have been made to identify the underlying Prakrit with some known Middle Indic dialect, on the basis of specific resemblances between such a dialect and Middle Indic elements in BHS. On careful examination, such points of agreement are usually found to be not sufficiently specific; that is, the feature in question turns out to occur in other Middle Indic dialects besides the one with which identification is proposed. Furthermore, any such point of agreement will always be found to be more than counterbalanced by points of disagreement. Hence, no doubt, scholars in recent times have become wary of such identifications. One of the latest to be published, as far as I know, is that of Lüders in Hoernle MR 162, who thought the original dialect of SP, at least, was Māgadhī, solely on the ground of voc. pl. forms in *āho* (but see § 1.38, fn. 16). For the views of Hiän-lin Dschi see §§ 1.24 ff., 1.97, and fn. 21 to § 1.81.

1.79. I find no reason to believe that the Prakrit chiefly underlying BHS, or any substantial part of its tradition, was an eastern dialect. I know no way of localizing it geographically at all. Complete dialectic unity, indeed, could not reasonably be expected, and will certainly not be found, in so large a body of texts, obviously of quite different dates.

1.80. I am not thinking of the varying degrees of Sanskritization, referred to above. If we limit our attention to non-Sanskrit forms, we still find variation; some forms which are common in certain works occur rarely, or perhaps not at all, in others; and often in the same work we find forms which may plausibly be taken to show dialect mixture. As is well known, Pali also shows linguistic differences between the gāthās, canonical prose, later prose, etc. (Geiger p. 1 f.), and dialect mixture in all of them. I should add that, as in the case of Pali, I find no reason to question the essential dialectic unity of the BHS Prakrit. Such differences as occur are minor compared to the great mass of resemblances.

1.81. In some cases, chronological layers in the same book are more easily detected by stylistic or metrical criteria than by morphological or phonological ones.[21] I have not felt it possible, in this work, to consider style or meter except as they seemed to me directly reflected in phonology or morphology. Nor have I attempted anything like a full collation of parallel passages (for examples see above, §§ 1.43 ff.), either within BHS itself, or between these texts and Pali or other Buddhist texts. Generally speaking, I have referred to such parallels only when I have found in them something useful for the interpretation of a BHS word or form. There is great need for much more extensive study of such parallels than has yet been made; I hope my work may help future workers in this field, but it does not claim to anticipate such work to any noteworthy extent.

1.82. My work aims to be descriptive rather than historical or comparative. Nevertheless, under each non-Skt. form recorded in the grammar I shall usually refer briefly to such correspondences in other MIndic dialects as I have noted. These references are very far from exhaustive, and are not intended to be that. In the now following sections I shall mention a few which are of special interest at this point, because they are not general

---

21. For stratification in Mv, see especially Windisch, Die Komposition des Mahāvastu, ASGW, ph.-hist. Kl., 27, Nr. 14, p. 476 ff.; Oldenberg, NAWGött. ph.-hist. Kl., 1912, Heft 2, p. 124 ff.; also id., Studien zur Geschichte des buddhistischen Kanons, ibidem 156 ff. Dschi, NAWGött. ph.-hist. Kl. 1949, p. 245 ff., Die Verwendung des Aorists als Kriterium für Alter und Ursprung buddhistischer Texte, finds a much greater number of aorists in the older than in the younger strata of Mv, and extends this criterion to other Buddhist texts. Some of his data are interesting and valuable, but at times I think he exaggerates the validity of his inferences. In particular, he seems to me to fail to distinguish between aorists of MIndic, or semi-MIndic, type, like *abhūṣi*, and thoroughly Sanskrit aorists like *prāvikṣat* (Divy; Dschi p. 261). The former may reasonably be considered relatively old in BHS; but forms like *prāvikṣat* are late, and belong to the Sanskritized stage of the language. It is significant that Dschi can cite no correspondent to *prāvikṣat* in Divy 39.19, 25, from the parallel passage in Pali. Sometimes such forms may indeed replace old (MIndic) aorists, as on p. 200 of Divy (Dschi p. 262), but this cannot be taken for granted; a late Sanskritizing author is also quite capable of introducing regular Sanskrit aorists in a BHS text, when an older form (if there was any) of the passage had none.—An example of how meter may give evidence of relative age is found in SP chapter 11, verses 42 ff. The meter here is obviously quite unlike the usual meter of the verses of SP and similar BHS texts. It alone proves that the passage is an interpolation. This fact is confirmed by the omission of all that follows verse 41 of this chapter in certain Chinese translations (see the KN ed., 256 note 5), and in the Kashgar ms. reported by La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1911, p. 1074.

MIndic or even 'general Prakrit'; some are even quite unknown elsewhere.

1.83. So, first and foremost, the loc. sg. of *a*-stems in *esmin* (or *esmiṃ*; also *esmi*), on which see §§ 8.70–73. It occurs very frequently, in the verses of most texts, and in the prose of Mv. Yet Senart systematically excluded it from his printed text of Mv. Many other editors have followed his example and relegated it to their critical apparatus. Yet it is very easily explained, and must certainly be accepted. Since it occurs in no other known dialect, and is so very common here, it alone is enough to prove that the BHS Prakrit is not exactly the same as any other known to us. In passing it may be noted that *asmiṃ* or *asmin* (also *asmi*) is likewise common (as in Pali), but that the alternative ending *aṃhi* (cf. Pali *amhi*; also in some Pkt. mss., according to Pischel 366a by corruption) is extremely rare; it can scarcely have been a form native to the underlying Prakrit. I have noted, in fact, only a single noun form in *aṃhi*; there are a very few pronouns. The locative ending *i* (which Pischel recognizes only for Ap.) occurs very often for *e* in verses of most texts, m.c.; it is not common in Mv, tho cases are found. The ending *aṃse*, recalling regular AMg. *aṃsi*, is recorded just once, in a verse of Mv (according to the mss.).

1.84. Another ending unknown elsewhere is *āvo* in the nom.-acc. pl. of fem. *ā*-stems. It occurs at least half a dozen times in Mv; nowhere else. It also occurs even in a masc. pl. voc., *āvusāvo*, § 8.89. It is probably somehow related to the commoner *āyo* (= Pali id., and probably Pkt. *āo*; otherwise Pischel); nom.-acc. pl. *āyā* and *āye* are perhaps to be recognized, tho they are very rare. On the *y* as against Prakrit zero cf. the oblique fem. *āye* (as in some Aśokan dialects), clearly corresponding to general Pkt. *āe* (which is very rare in BHS); *āye* is almost limited to Mv, but commoner there than *āya*, which is the regular ending in (verses of) most texts and is also familiar enough in Mv. The oblique fem. ending *ā* (bare stem), known in Pali, is rather rare in BHS.

1.85. The endings of fem. *ī* (and *i*-)stems are partly analogous to those of *ā*-stems; but the *i* may be short (without correlation with the historic quantity of the stem vowel), as in Pali oblique sg. *iyā* (but Pkt. regularly *īe*, *īa*). Thus the usual oblique sg. fem. endings in Mv, including prose, are *īye*, *iye*; in other texts these occur chiefly in verses; and in most texts, even in verses, *īya*, *iya* are commoner; *īyo*, *iyo* also occur, rarely, and chiefly in Mv; also *yā*, *ya*, as generalized oblique endings, chiefly in verses. Fem. *u*-, *ū*-stems (much fewer in number) are roughly analogous to *i*-, *ī*-stems.

1.86. Another ending not recorded elsewhere is a general oblique form of *ar*-stems in *are* or *ari*, fairly well attested, but only in Mv, and always in prose. It is found from both m. (*pitare*, *pitari*) and f. stems, but I presume that it is analogous to the (regularly fem.) oblique endings *iye*, *uye*, of *i*- and *u*-stems.

1.87. The gen. pl. *sānaṃ* (cf. the general Pkt. gen. sg. *se*), 'of these' (to stem *sa*-: *ta*-), is not clearly recorded elsewhere. In BHS it is limited to Mv, but quite frequent there.

1.88. The aorist and optative use a 3 pl. ending *etsuḥ* or *etsu*; also, rarely, *atsu(ḥ)*, *itsu(ḥ)*, and *tsu(ḥ)* after other vowels. These are extremely common in Mv, tho Senart regularly emends them to *-nsu(ḥ)*; elsewhere they are rare. Outside of Mv, the usual 3 pl. aor. ending is *iṣu* (also found in verses of Mv), for Skt. *iṣuḥ*; it is precisely paralleled only in Aśokan inscriptions (especially Shahbazgarhi; oftener *isu*); cf. Pali *isuṃ*. Also, less often, we find *iṃsu* = Pali and AMg. id.

1.89. Only in Mmk, we find a 3 pl. preterite (middle) ending *ire* (cf. Pali *are*); and, in perfect forms, *ure* for Skt. *ire*.

1.90. The root *gam* forms a future *gaṃsati* etc., quite common in Mv, not noted elsewhere in BHS, and seemingly not exactly paralleled in other dialects; but for possibly related forms see Bloch, Indo-Aryen 88 (after H. Smith).

1.91. Very often in Mv, and occasionally in other texts, the augment *a*- is prefixed to present tense forms, especially of the root *bhāṣ* 'speak'. Even an optative form is thus provided with the augment. Cf. for Pali s.v. [1]*a*- and *amāpeti* in CPD.

1.92. The regular, and in most texts extremely common, aorist of the root *bhū* is *abhūṣi* (rarely Sktized as *abhūṣīt*). No other known MIndic dialect has such a form, nor any form resembling it, unless we count the Aśokan 3 pl. *husu* (and once 1 sg. *husaṃ*).

1.93. Entirely unparalleled, so far as I know, is the present *sthihati*, from root *sthā* (§ 28.43). It is however quite common, especially in Mv, and common enough in other texts, so that it seems reasonable to suppose that a Middle Indic form (**ṭhihati* or **thihati*?) on which it is based was the regular present of *sthā* in the dialect. Once there is trace of a similar present **-dhihati* (aor. *-dhihe*) to *dhā*.

1.94. The occurrence of *e* instead of *o*, as representing Skt. final *as* (*ar*, *aḥ*), is found in the adverbs *pure* (fairly common) and *ante* (rare), and sporadically in the n. (and voc.) sg. m. (also nt.) of *a*-stem nouns and pronouns. It is also found, to about the same extent, in Pali. See § 1.32 with fn. 11.

1.95. Very common is *u* for (chiefly final) *o* (almost always representing Skt. *as*). For the most part it is limited to verses, probably metri causa. For its morphological range see §§ 3.51 ff. In Mv it is quite rare, and seems not to occur in prose. According to Pischel, it should be recognized only for Ap. among the dialects which he treats. It is however found in northwestern Prakrit (Dutreuil de Rhins; Niya, Burrow op. cit. § 12, in adverbs), and in all varieties of Ap. (Tagare, Hist. Gram. of Ap., Poona, 1948, p. 27). But BHS *a* is commoner than *u*; it is very common in Ap. but also known in various other dialects, at least AMg. and Mg. (Pischel 364). In BHS it seems to be nearly or quite restricted to use m.c.; it is hardly found in prose. Less common, but well established, is *ā*; it even occurs, tho rarely, as acc. sg. It is recorded in Aśokan, and in all local varieties of Ap., according to Tagare p. 27 (not recognized by the grammarians).

1.96. For final *am* or *aṃ*, not only as acc. sg. m. and nom.-acc. sg. nt. of *a*-stems but everywhere else (e. g. in *aham*, *ayam*), BHS may substitute *u*, apparently only in verses, m.c. The morphological range of the substitution is summarized in § 3.58. In BHS it seems to me that this *u* is not to be regarded as a reduction of *o*, or in any way related to *o*. We find BHS *o* for *am* only in a very few cases (§ 8.36) of acc. sg. m. or nom.-acc. sg. nt. of *a*-stems, where it seems clearly due to morphological confusion (nom. for acc., m. for nt.). The situation seems therefore quite different from that of the northwestern Prakrits of the Niya and Khotan documents and the 'Prakrit Dharmapada' (ms. Dutreuil de Rhins), where both *o* and *u* seem to occur for final *am* generally (evidence summarized by Dschi, see § 1.97). For final *am* we find *u* also in Ḍhakkī Prakrit (Pischel 351) and especially in Ap.; Jacobi (San. XXVIII) tentatively proposed to regard *u* as characteristic of Western Ap., as against *a* of Eastern Ap.; Tagare shows, however, that while *a* is commoner in Eastern than in Western Ap., *u* is found quite commonly in all varieties of Ap. (see his Hist. Gram. of Ap., pp. 108, 111 ff. for *a*-stem nouns, 208, 242, et alibi, for pronominal forms). Since Tagare's work it seems to me clear that in Ap. generally, as in BHS, the phonetic change of final *am* to *u* must be recognized, tho in BHS it is used only in verses m.c.

1.97. In NAWGött. ph.-hist. Kl., 1944, Nr. 6, pp. 121—144, Hiän-lin Dschi discusses 'Die Umwandlung der Endung *-aṃ* in *-o* and *-u* im Mittelindischen'. He regards *o* and *u* for *aṃ* as equivalent, which is not true for BHS (he considers that here *o* 'has almost disappeared', p. 133, implying a one-time existence), nor for Aśokan (Shahbazgarhi, where only *o* is found, not *u*). He refers (136) to a then unpublished monograph of his own (since published, see § 1.24 ff.) in which he thinks he has proved that the older parts of both the Pali and BHS canons are based on an old canon in an eastern, 'old Ardha-Māgadhī' dialect. I have shown above why I do not agree with him. He believes, however, that *u* for *aṃ* is a dialectic feature of northwestern Middle Indic, following Jacobi in the now untenable assumption that it did not exist in Eastern Apabhraṃśa. He explains its frequent occurrence in BHS as secondary, and due to relatively late influence of some northwestern Prakrit. The only specific evidence he cites for this is a collection of about 50 cases in which, according to the KN edition of SP, the Kashgar recension reads *aṃ* (or *a*) where the KN text has *u*, with some Nepalese mss. He assumes that these cases are typical and that they prove that the older (Kashgar) form of SP had *aṃ* or *a* generally, and that *u* was introduced later in the 'Nepalese recension'. His arguments do not convince me, for several reasons. First, in many of his instances, some or even most of the Nepalese mss. of SP are reported as reading *a(ṃ)*, like the Kashgar recension; for such readings, Nep. can not be said clearly to support the supposedly 'secondary' *u*. Secondly, we have as yet only very scanty information about the Kashgar recension of SP; Dschi's few cases do not prove that the Kashgar recension avoided *u* for *aṃ*. Indeed, it would be very strange if it did so; we should expect it to agree with northwestern Prakrits, which are precisely the ones which according to Dschi show *u* for *aṃ* (tho he is wrong in denying this change to Eastern Apabhraṃśa with Jacobi). Thirdly, the change of *am* to *u* is common in the verses of most BHS texts, and it would take much more evidence than Dschi adduces to prove it a late or secondary feature. It is true (tho not noted by Dschi) that it is rare in Mv. But, tho Mv is probably the oldest BHS text we have, not all the positive and negative formal differences between it and later texts can reasonably be explained as due to secondary changes in the latter. And *u* for *aṃ* is not entirely unknown in Mv; perhaps in its original form it was much commoner, and has for some reason been nearly eliminated in the course of tradition. The same may be true, e. g., of *u* for *o*, and of the loc. *i* for *e*, which are also rare in our mss. of Mv. I have noted that the mss., and Senart's edition, of Mv very often read final *-aṃ* in verses in positions where it is metrically impossible, because a short syllable is required. In all such cases the original text must have read either *a* or *u* for *aṃ*; no one can say which.

1.98. Peculiar to BHS as far as I know is the very common substitution of *o* for final *a* in verses, m.c. It is not a phonetic change but due to morphological analogy, §§ 3.79–88.

1.99. Reference was made above to the voc. pl. ending *āho*, of masc. *a*-stems (cf. Mg. *āho*, Ap. *aho*, *ahu*), which occurs not only in Mv (fairly often) but also in SP, and even in its prose, according to the Kashgar recension. It occurs once in a fem. *ā*-stem, and there is even a case of *devīho*, voc. pl. of *devī* (both these in Mv).

1.100. The personal pronouns are, as in most dialects, extremely varied and confused; see the chapter dealing with them. Some forms have few or no correspondents elsewhere. The chapter on the generic pronouns will also present some curiosities.

1.101. The confusion of person and number in verb inflection transcends by far anything noted elsewhere; §§ 25.4 ff. It is even found in the prose of texts which present a superficial appearance of pretty complete Sanskritization, such as Divy, ŚsP, and Laṅk, not to mention the prose of LV.

1.102. The gerund ending *i*, which I believe is historically derived from Skt. *ya* by 'saṃprasāraṇa', seems to be known otherwise only in Ap.

1.103. Constructions with the negative particle *mā* have seemed to me so peculiar as to deserve a special chapter. Most of them can, to be sure, probably be paralleled elsewhere, even in Epic and other aberrant forms of Sanskrit. I do not know of any parallel for the fairly common use of *mā* in questions, especially as equivalent to Skt. *kaccin na*, when a negative response is desired or hoped for, as in *māsi dāsī*, '(I hope) you aren't a slave-woman, are you?'

1.104.. The above list could be indefinitely extended by including morphological features which are more widely paralleled in Middle Indic, and on the other hand some which, while not widely paralleled, are scantily or dubiously recorded in BHS.

1.105. Summarizing the results which BHS grammar as a whole seems to indicate as to the dialectic relations of the underlying Prakrit, we find:

(1) In a substantial number of cases, BHS features are either unique, or virtually so. Attention has been called above to the most important of these.

(2) While it has some features in common with Pali, on the whole its morphology is definitely unlike Pali in many important respects.

(3) It has a few special features in common with Apabhraṃśa; but its general character is clearly older than Ap., and more in line with Prakrit as a whole. The features which constitute this 'general character' are for the most part such as can be described as 'common Prakrit', or even 'common Middle Indic' (e. g. treatment of consonant clusters). In my opinion they do not justify the assumption of specially close relations between the Prakrit underlying our dialect and any other specific dialect known to us. I now believe that I was wrong in seeing special relations to Ardha-Māgadhī (BSOS 8.501 ff.). Nearly all the features which I there listed as common to BHS and AMg. are also found in other Prakrits, or Pali, or both.

(4) No one, to my knowledge, has suggested identifying the BHS Prakrit with Ap. Since identification with AMg. has been suggested, it seems worth while to list some striking differences between the two: BHS loc. sg. *esmiṃ* (also loc. ending *i* representing *e*; *aṃse*, cf. AMg. *aṃsi*, recorded just once); nom.-acc. pl. fem. *āvo*; oblique sg. fem. *āye*, *īye*, etc. (AMg. and general Prakrit have, to be sure, similar forms lacking the *y*), and *āyo*, *īyo*; oblique sg. *are*, *ari*, from stems in *ar*; gen. pl. *sānaṃ* to stem *sa-*; 3 pl. aor. *etsu(ḥ)* and *iṣu*; *gaṃsati* as fut. of *gam*; *abhūṣi*, the regular aor. of *bhū*; *sthihati*, common present of *sthā*; *u* for final *o* and *aṃ*, both extremely common; *o* for final *a* m.c.; voc. pl. *āho*; gerund ending *i*.

(5) The Prakrit underlying BHS was certainly not identical with any Middle Indic dialect otherwise known to us.

The BHS lexicon

1.106. The non-Sanskrit words used in BHS, aside from proper names, correspond to Pali words in the overwhelming majority of cases. Many even of the proper names have Pali correspondents. Naturally, certain linguistic alterations are more or less regularly involved, and sometimes the meaning varies. But in the great mass of cases the meaning is the same, and the changes in form are self-explanatory; so e. g. *ātmabhāva*, 'body', = Pali *attabhāva*. It may, however, be worth while to cite from the Dictionary, which should be consulted for the facts regarding each word, a few Pali-BHS correspondences which are not quite so simple, either formally or semantically: *anyātaka*, *(a-)sāmpreya* (= Pali [*a-*]*sappāya*; both forms obscure), *kilāsin*, *kisara*, *kusīda* and *kausīdya*, *prahāṇa*, etc.; see the Index at the end of the Dictionary. Not infrequently a BHS form is helpful on doubtful, or at least disputed, points of Pali lexicography. So, e. g., BHS *praśreṣṭha*, 'very superior', supports Pali *paseṭṭha*

(Pv ii.9.75) against the PTSD emendation *pasaṭṭha* (for which the proper Pali form is *pasattha* = Skt. *praśasta*).

1.107. As stated above (§ 1.63), when a BHS word has a Pali correspondent known to me, my Dictionary cites that; and as a rule it cites no other. In the rare cases where corresponding words in other dialects give additional help towards understanding the BHS word, such words are also cited. When, however, I have found no correspondent in Pali, I have always tried to find one in some other MIndic source. In quite a few such cases a correspondent has been found in Prakrit, especially Ardha-Māgadhī, the canonical language of the Jains, and the vehicle of the oldest extensive literature preserved to us in any Prakrit dialect.

1.108. The following BHS words, on which see my Dictionary, have (more or less close) correspondents at least in AMg., often also in other Prakrits, but not in Pali: *agārastha*, *anavarāgra* (closer to AMg. than to Pali correspondent), *anurāgataṃ*, *andhāra* (Skt., Pali *andhakāra*), *anvādiśati* 'commands', *apharādhyati* 'disappears', *abhyaṅgeti*, *alinda*, *avaśya* (*osa*), *asita* 'inauspicious, offensive', *īṣi(t)*, *utkrośayati* 'exalts', *uttaka*(?), *uttima*, *utthala*, *upapeta*, *urasa*, *ulla*, *ūrmi*, *ekāhatya*, *ettiya* (also *ettaka* = Pali id.), *em* (for Skt. *evam*), *eluka*, *kaṇṭheguṇa*, *kaṇḍita*, *kalāva*, *kallavāla*, *kaṣaṭṭa*, *kīrtika* (hyper-Skt., cf. AMg. *kittiā* = Skt. *kṛttikā*), *korpara* and *kaurpara*, *kośikāra*, *khaṭṭika*, *khu* and *hu* (Skt. *khalu*; Pali *kho*, before vowels *khv-*), *-khuttaṃ* or *-khutto*, *gomukhī*, *goṣṭhika*, *gaura-khara*, *carpaṭaka*(?), *choḍayati* or *chor°*, *tāyin*, *tiriccha*, *tuṇa*, *trehika*, *tharatharāyate*, *diśi*, *daumya*, *nakula* (a musical instrument), *nandī(-mukhā)*, *nayuta*, *niśṛṇoti*, *niṣkuṭa*, *parisāmanta*, *pāṇa* (= *caṇḍāla*), *pāri*, *puṣkarasārī*, *phalikha*, *bhukṣa* (and congeners), *bhramarikā*, *miṇḍha*, *murava*, *mohaṃ*, *vallarī*, *vāsīcandanakalpa*, *vidhūna*, *veṣṭi*, *vaiśramaṇa*, *śaniścara*, *haḍi*, *hastala*. The list does not claim to be complete, but is thought to contain a good proportion of the clear and important cases. Cf. the Index at the end of the Dictionary.

1.109. There are also words not found in Skt., Pali, or AMg., but with correspondents, more or less close, in some other Prakrit, Ap., or the Deśīnāmamālā: *avidhaṃ* or *avidhā*, *ārāgayati*, *āvārī*, *upalagna*, *edānīm*, *kāhala*, *kṣaṇika*, *guhmita*, *cakoraka*, *tīmayati*, *daṇḍavāsika*, *dūṣika*, 1 *dvīpika*, *nirviśiṣṭa*, *palāna*, *paligodha*, *popphala*, *muṣaṇa*, *viparokṣa*, *vella*.

1.110. Finally, there are quite a good many words recorded nowhere else than in BHS. Many of these are proper names, mostly of transparent formation. Many others are equally transparent and simple in formation; the lack of record of them elsewhere may often be accidental. Not a few, on the contrary, are completely obscure in formation, and sometimes of uncertain meaning; even the reading may frequently be questioned. The mss. of the Mahāvastu, especially, contain many dubious forms, which are extensively emended by Senart, often successfully, but I fear often unsuccessfully. It has not seemed to me profitable to list such problematic or obscure forms at this point. Nor, on the other hand, shall I present here formations which are made with elements and in ways normal to either Sanskrit or Middle Indic, so that the fact that I have failed to find them elsewhere may be only an accident.

1.111. I shall, however, mention a few samples of specific BHS vocabulary, tending to prove my thesis that we are dealing with a real language, not a modification or corruption of any other dialect on record, and as individual in its lexicon as it has been shown to be in its grammar. These words seem textually reliable, not mere corruptions. For the most part they are not wholly obscure in etymology. And I have found no record of them elsewhere. One of the most interesting is *parindāmi*, or *parīndāmi* (also *anu-pa°*), 'I hand over, present, deliver'. It seems clearly related to Skt. *paridadāti*, of like meaning; BHS has *anuparītta*, 'handed over' (but I find no *anupari-dā* in Skt., Pali, or Pkt.). Others, on which see the Dict., are: 1 *akhila* 'ungentle, harsh'; *aṇvati*, 'goes'; 2 *adhyālambati*, 'grasps'; *anyatra* (1), 'on the contrary'; *apakṣāla*, 'fault'; *abhichādayati*, 'presents'; *abhisāra*, 'gift, honorarium'; *utplāvayati*, 'leads astray', also *utplāvaka*; *ṛg-iti*, *rig-iti*, *ṛṭ-iti*, 'instantly'; *ṛlla(ka)*, 'prizefighter'; *kākhorda*, an evil spirit (Iranian loan?); *chāyika* or *°kā*, 'ashes' (cf. Pali *chārikā*, AMg. *chāri(y)a*, *°yā*); *jitam*, interj. of astonishment; *jihma* in the meanings 'obscure, deprived of light, dull' and 'disappointed, depressed', with derivatives; *nirmādayati*, 'washes'; *palikuñc(ik)a*, *°cikā*, '(thatched) hut (of straw)'; *puḍinī*, 'pool'; *pūri*, *pūrī*, 'fulfilling, full measure'; *prativahati*, 'opposes, rejects, disobeys', and n. act. *prativahana*; *prativibudhyate*, 'wakes up', especially common in the ppp. *prativibuddha*; *bhit(t)vara*; *yad uta*; *vidaṅgikā*; *sukhila*, 'happy', and *duḥkhila*, 'unhappy'; *sumbhaka*, 'bowl', and *sumbhalikā*. This list could be considerably extended.

2. Phonology, Consonants

2.1. Of the many traces of MIndic phonology affecting consonants in the written tradition of BHS, the majority fall under the head of assimilation between adjoining consonants in Skt.

2.2. In an article on Meter, Phonology, and Orthography in BHS, JAOS 66.197–206, I showed that the metrical structure of BHS verses in the older texts proves that such assimilation was much commoner than one would judge from the writing found in our mss. and editions. The meter can be understood only on the assumption that initial consonant clusters were regularly simplified to a single consonant. This implies previous assimilation, as in MIndic. We must therefore assume that in the underlying dialect such assimilation took place; and if initially, presumably also medially, tho this cannot be revealed by the meter. Note also, in the (prose) spelling lesson LV 127.5 ff., such indications of MIndic assimilation as *ñakāre jñāpanaśabdaḥ* (16; so mss., obviously pronounced *ñāp°*), *ṭhakāre ṭhapanīyapraśnaśabdaḥ* (17), *thakāre thāma . . . śabdaḥ* (19); also such spellings as *traya-tiṃśad* LV 61.16 (prose).

2.3. Similarly, final consonants (except generally nasals) were or could be dropped, as meter proves. In this case even the writting gives more extensive support. And in some other points, as the following will show, there is evidence that the consonantism of MIndic was, on the whole, characteristic for the dialect underlying BHS.

2.4. In general, we shall note here only MIndic processes reflected in the written tradition. Any other procedure would seem arbitrary and subjective. Occasionally, however, we shall refer to metrical facts, when they seem to help in making comprehensible the forms recorded.

Assimilation of consonants

2.5. On a rather wide scale we find evidence of assimilation of a stop or other consonant to an adjoining stop. A list of examples, certainly not exhaustive, and chiefly limited to those recognized in writing, follows. When no special reference is given, the Dictionary will show the occurrences.

2.6. *kt*(*h*) altered to *tt*(*h*): *suyutta* = *suyukta*; *madhusitthena*, cf. Skt. *siktha*.

ky to *kk*: *śakkita*, ppp. to Pali *sakkati* = Skt. *śakyati*, *°te*.

kr to *kk*, initially *k*: *koḍa-* = *kroḍa-*; *koṣṭuka* 'jackal' = *kro°*; *kimi* = *krimi* (or *kṛmi*; § 3.91); even in root-initial in a derivative of a cpd. verb, *prakāntā* = *prakrāntāḥ*.

On *kṣ* to *kh*, see § 2.25.

2.7. *gr* to *gg*: *aviggṛhītā* = Skt. *a-vigṛ°* Samādh p. 49 line 26 (vs). Most cpds. of root *grah*, in weak-grade forms, are written in our texts with single *g*. But in verses the meter regularly requires a long preceding syllable; suggesting that the true pronunciation was with *gg* as in Pali and Pkt. (analogically carried over from full-grade forms with Skt. *-gr-*). And this in turn implies that in full-grade forms, *-gr-* in compounds of *grah-* was assimilated to *gg* (JAOS 66.201; § 44). Some examples: *pari(g)gṛhīta* SP 89.8; LV 158.12; 190.14; Śikṣ 43.6, 8; *prati(g)gṛhīta* LV 411.21; *prati(g)gṛhītvā* LV 387.7; *prati(g)gṛhṇe* Mv i.220.13 = ii.22.14; *anugṛhītā* SP 166.6 (so Nep. mss.; ed. with Kashgar rec. *anugrahītā*, perhaps false Skt. for original *anugg°*?); in Divy 401.18 text *nirgṛhīta*, which is certainly false Skt. for *ni(g)g°* = Pali *niggahīta*, Skt. *nigṛhīta*, 'checked, humbled'.

2.8. *cy* to *cc*, initially *c*: *vuccati*, *vuccanti*, *pravuccati* (§ 2.51), *uccati*, etc., = *ucyate* etc.; *ruccati* = *rucyati*; *paccate* = *pacyate*; *cavitvā* = *cya°*; *-cuti* = *cyuti*.

jy to *jj*, initially *j*: *bhajjati* = *bhajyate*; *jeṣṭha-* = *jye°*; *sa-jotiṣa*; *su-jota-*; *lujjati*.

jv to *jj*, initially *j*: *jalūṣitā* = Skt. *jvaloṣitā*, *jvāl°*; *jālayiṣyati* = *jvāl°*. .

2.9. *ḍy* to *ḍḍ*: *kuḍḍa* 'wall' = Pali id., Skt. *kuḍya*.

tk to *kk*: *ukkāsita* = *utk°*; *ukkāsati*, *ukkāsana*; *ukkaṭṭati*; *Ukkala*; *ukkarikā* = *utk°*; *ukkārika* (nt.?) (read *ukkar°*?).

tm to *tt*: *attātamīya* = Pali *attattaniya*, Skt. *ātmātmīya*.

tr to *tt*, initially *t*: *kṛttima* = *kṛtrima*; 1 *citta* = *citra* (Skt. *caitra*), n. of a month; *cittaratha* = *citraratha*; 2 *ti-* = *tri-*; *tāyana*, *°ṇa* = *trāyaṇa*, 'saving'.

ts to *tth*, initial *th*: *tharu* = Pali id., Skt. *tsaru*.

dg to *gg*: *uggami* (v.l. *udgami*) Mv ii.91.17; *uggiramānā* Mv ii.412.1 (mss. *ugguru°*, *udguru°*; to *udgirati*; but perhaps read *ugguru°*?).

dv to *dd*: *aviddasu*.

dhr to *ddh*: *gṛddha(kūṭa)* = *gṛdhra°*; *vaddha-* = Pali id., Skt. *vadhra* or *vardhra*.

2.10. *pt* to *tt*: *gutti* = *gupti*; *atitti*, perhaps = *atṛpti*; *āṇatti(kā)* = Pali id., Skt. *ājñapti*, also *āṇatta*, etc.; *vutta* = Pali id., Skt. *upta*.

py to *pp*: *patappanti* = *pratapyanti*, which is read in a repetition.

pr to *pp*, initially *p*: *pamattabandhu* = *pra°*; *paṇidhi*; *pavararṣiṇa* = *pra°*; *patappanti*, see *py* to *pp*; *payyaka* = Pali id., Skt. **prāryaka*.

2.11. *rt* to *ṭṭ*: *nivuṭṭati* = *nivartati*.

rt to *tt*: *adhivattati*, v.l. for *adhivartati*, q.v. Dict.

rdh to *ḍḍh*: *aḍḍhatiya* = Pali id., for *ardha-* (Dict.).

rdh to *ddh*: *omuddhaka* = *avamūrdha(ka)*; *vaddhāpayitvā*, *°petvā*, *°pita*, = *vardh°*.

rp to *pp*: *appehi* = Skt. *arpaya*.

2.12. *śc*, *śch* to *cch*: *pacche* or *pacchā* = *paścāt*, *pacchimaka* (v.l. *paści°*); *tiraccha*, *tiracchāna* = Pali id. (cf. Skt. *tiraścīna*), also *tiriccha*, *tiricchāna*; *ducchana* (read prob. *°channa*).

ṣṭ to *ṭṭh* (*ṭh*): *vighuṭṭhaṃ* (*°ṣṭaṃ*); *saṃvimaṭṭha* = *-mṛṣṭa*; simplified to *ṭh* after long vowel in *veṭh-ayati* etc. = *veṣṭ-*. A hyper-Sktism is *adhyuṣṭa*, q.v. in Dict., Mvy 8172, for AMg. *addhuṭṭha* (Pali *aḍḍhuḍḍha*).

sk, *skh* to *kkh*, initially *kh*: *khandhāvāra* = *skandhāvāra*; *khalitaṃ* = Pali id., Skt. *skha°*; *khali* (see *khalati*); *prakhalamānair* = *pra-skha°*.

st, *sth* to (*ṭṭh*,) initially *ṭh* (cf. next): *ṭhambhanāś* = *sta°*; *ṭhapeti* etc., see Chap. 43, s.v. *sthā* (9), and cf. *ṭhakāre ṭhapanīyapraśnaśabdaḥ* LV 127.17. Hyper-Skt. *puṣkarāstika*, *vanāstika* = Pali *pokkharaṭṭha*, *vanaṭṭha*.

st, *sth* to *tth*, initially *th* (cf. preceding): *pallatthikā* (Pali id.) = *paryastikā* (so Mvy 8544); *-vittharikāṃ* = *°vistarikāṃ*; *uttharya* (? to *ud* with *stṛ*); *thapeti* etc., see Chap. 43, s.v. *sthā* (9); *thāpayiṣye*, see ibid. s.v. *sthā* (8); cf. *thakāre thāma . . . śabdaḥ* LV 127.19; *thera* 'old man' = *sthavira*; *thala* = *sthala*; *thaṇḍila* = *stha°*; *thīna*. Hyper-Skt. *śista* (Dict.) for Pali *sittha* (Skt. *siktha*).

st to *t*, initially: *tabdha* = *stabdha* (prose; Pali *thaddha*).

sp to *p*, initially: *pṛśati* and other forms of *spṛś*, see Chap. 43, s.v. *spṛś* (3): *pṛhā* = *spṛhā*.

sph to *ph*, initially: (*prīti-*)*phuṭā* = °*sphuṭā*; *pharati* etc. = *sphar*°, also *pharaṇa*. Note the hyper-Sanskritism *sphāla* = Skt. *phāla* 'plowshare' Mvy 5643 (surely not an inheritance from prehistoric initial *s-*).

2.13. Hypersanskritic substitutes for Skt. double stops are rare; cf. some of the preceding §§; in Mv i.20.2, mss. present the strange form *marj(j)a-* for *majja(n)*, 'marrow', see Dict.

2.14. As in MIndic, assimilation of a dental and a following *y* may yield a double palatal: *praccaya* = Pali *paccaya*, Skt. *pratyaya*; *khijjati* = *khidyate*; *khajjati* = *khādyate*; note *khajjanti* Mv i.360.1, repeated as *khādyanti* ibid. 3; also *khajjaka*; *vijjhati* = *vidhyati*; *anumajjhima* = *anumadhyama*; *bhijje*, Chap. 43, s.v. *bhid* (2). See also *raccha*(? *-ā*) for *rathyā*, § 2.18. For hyper-Skt. back-formations on this model, see Dict. s. vv. (*abhi-*)*dhyāyati* (Pali *jhāyati*); *vadya*(*te*).

2.15. *jñ* to *ññ*, initially *ñ*; for this *ny* may be written; also *ṇ*, *nn*. Sporadically we meet spellings pointing to *ññ*, or initially *ñ*, for *jñ* as in Pali. Cf. § 2.2; *anyātaka* = *ajñāta*(*ka*); *añānu* = *ajñānaṃ*; in Mv i.351.14 mss. *samanyā*, a way of writing something like Pali *samaññā*, for *samājñā*; similarly *anyāsi*, mss., Mv iii.386.18, for *ajñāsi* (which Senart reads) or *ājñāsi*, aorist of (*ā*)*jñā*. In Mv i.247.10 (vs) Senart em. *samājñā* for mss. *samanyite*, a puzzling form, in a line which is unmetr. and clearly corrupt. In Mv iii.284.4, Senart reads *aññāya* with the Pali equivalent (see Dict. s.v.) for mss. *anyāya*. For Skt. *ājñā*, *ājñapta*, °*ti*, and related words, Mv repeatedly reads *āṇā*, *āṇatta*, °*ti*(*kā*), etc. as in Pali. Isolated is *sannīyate* for *saṃjñāyate*; § 37.3 n.1; for the nasal see Pischel 276.

2.16. Other MIndic consonantal assimilations, occurring in writing sporadically:

ṇḍ to *ṇṇ*: *ṣaṇṇa* = Skt. *ṣaṇḍa*, 'thicket', Gv 408.4; see Dict. This type of assimilation is found in the NW Prakrit of the ms. Dutreuil de Rhins, Senart, JA Sept.-Oct. 1898, 212, top. I have failed to note any other case in BHS.

[*my* to *mm*: *sammā* = Pali id., Skt. *samyak*, assumed by Senart Mv i.211.7, but only by a false em., see Dict.]

mr to *mm*, initially *m*: *-makṣitā* = *mrakṣitā*.

ry to *yy*: *ayyaka* = Pali id., Skt. *āryaka*; *payyaka* = Pali id., Skt. **prāryaka*.

ry to *ll*: *pallatthikā* = Pali id., Skt. *paryastikā*; *pallānati* 'harnesses', based on Skt. *paryāṇayati*, denom. to *paryāṇa* 'saddle'.

rl to *ll*: *dullabha* = *durl*°.

ly to *ll*: *śallayati*, denom. to *śalya*.

vr to (initially) *v*: *pra-vajita* = °*vraj*° (except one doubtful Pali form *pavajamāna*, see PTSD, only *bb* and *vv* are recorded in this base in Pali and Pkt.).

sm to (initially) *s*: *sarati* = *smarati*.

Sibilant plus *r* or *v* to theoretically double, but initially single, sibilant: *saṃsati* = *sraṃsati*; *sutā* = *śrutā*; *pra-savanti* = *pra-sravanti*; *a-saddadhāno* = *a-śrad*°; *sāpateya* = Pali id., Skt. *svā*°; *setaka* = Pali id., for *śveta-ka*; *prati-śaya* = *prati-śraya* (*śr* initial in root).

Semivowels 'lost' in triconsonantal clusters

2.17. Doubtless really assimilatory in character, but perhaps in part mere errors of tradition, are cases in which y, r, or v is lost after (less commonly before) a consonant cluster, or at least what is written as such.

Loss of y. On *kṣ*: *kṣy* see § 2.23. Otherwise note *kāṃsa-* and *kaṃsa-* 'brass', for *kāṃsya*; *antaka* (cf. Pali *anta*, Skt. *antya*).

Loss of r. BHS repeatedly presents *bhats-* for Skt. *bharts-*. For *vardhra*, even Skt. records *vadhra*, which is also found in BHS, with *vadhrī*; these are probably semi-MIndic forms. Pure MIndic (Pali *vaddha*) is *vaddha-paṭikā* for *va*(*r*)*dhra-*. Also *ucchethā*, prob. for *ucchrethā* = *ucchrayatha* or better *ucchrayadhvam*, 'arise!', see Chap. 43, s. vv. *chid* (3) and *śri*; *janta-* = *jantra*, *yantra-*, *jantitā* = *yantritā*.

Loss of v, after *kṣ*: *prakṣeḍā*, *prakṣeḍita* = °*kṣveḍ*°.

ch

2.18. As in MIndic, *ch* replaces not only Skt. *śc* (§ 2.12), but also *kṣ* and *ts*; rarely *sk* (*chambh-* = Skt. *skambh-*). Examples of *kṣ*: *tacchita*, *tacchaka* (*takṣ-*); *ruccha* = *rūkṣa* (in Pali only *lūkha*; AMg. *lūha* and *rukkha*; no *ruccha* recorded in MIndic for this word); *kaccha* = *kakṣa*. — *ts*: *ucchaṅga-* (*-pāda*, or *-caraṇa*), one of the 32 lakṣaṇa; variants *ucchaṅkha-*, *utsaṅga-* (Pali *ussaṅkha-*); *ucchada*(*ka*); *ucchahati*, °*te*, = *utsahate*; *kucchanti* = *kutsa*(*ya*)*nti*; *nirbhacchita* = *nirbhartsita* (Pali *nibbhaccheti*); (*a-*)*macchara* = *matsara*; *maccha* = *matsya*; *ucchava* (AMg. id., but Pali *ussava*).—Also for *thy*: *raccha* = (or read) *racchā* (as in Pali) = *rathyā*.

2.19. Note also the hyper-Skt. *utsiṣṭa* for *ucchiṣṭa*; *jugutsu* for *jugupsu* (MIndic *cch* falsely Sanskritized as *ts* instead of *ps*); *utsṛta* for *ucchrita*.

2.20. In Skt. *ch* is always a long or double consonant, whether written *cch* or not. In BHS the meter shows inconsistency. At the beginning of a word, it is to be sure always single; that is, when a short vowel precedes, that syllable is short. So also in cpds.; e. g. not only *kileśa-chedanī* LV 53.13, and *achidra* (short first syllable) Bhad 17, but *pratichādā* (short antepenult) RP 46.18, and in verb compounds, *ucchoṣyatu* Suv. 53.10; *vicchidyatu* Suv 53.12, etc. But even in the middle of a word the syllable before (*c*)*ch* may be short, as in *icchati* LV 45.11; *gacchata* LV 36.19. On the other hand, it is long, as in Skt., in *icchate* LV 46.3, 9; various forms of *gacch-* SP 113.7; LV 50.7; 74.6, 10; 78.15; 81.11, etc.

2.21. Sporadically, as in Pali, *s* appears for (*c*)*ch* in a (Skt.) consonant cluster: *kisara* = Pali *kasira* (beside *kiccha*) = *kṛcchra* (Geiger 59.2).

2.22. Merely graphic corruption seems to me concerned in writings of *cch* for *tth*; see Dict. s.vv. *itthatva*, *ucchihitvā*, *nipacchita*(?).

kṣ, kṣy, ṣ, kh

2.23. We find both *kṣ* written for usual *kṣy*, and vice versa. This probably is at least in part a matter of phonetic uncertainty (perhaps imperfect Sanskritization), interchange, or corruption. But it may also have morphological bearings. I have recorded *kṣy* for *kṣ* only in present forms of root *īkṣ* (see Chap. 43, s.v.); these may be 4th class presents (§ 28.28). Conversely, futures containing (*k*)*ṣ* instead of normal (*k*)*ṣy* could be classed with other futures lacking *y* (§ 31.26). Then we need not regard as purely phonetic such forms as *prativakṣanti* LV 88.14–15 (so read for *pratipakṣaṃ pakṣanti*, cf. Weller 23, 41); *pravekṣi* for °*kṣye* LV 223.4 (vs, both edd., no v.l.); *drakṣase* LV 237.10 (all mss., only Calc. *drakṣyase*); less certain is LV 396.8, where Lefm. reads by em. *nakṣyate . . . vinakṣyate* (the corrupt mss. all lack *y*; I conjecture (*vi-*)*naṃkṣate* = Skt. (*vi-*)*naṅkṣyate*, fut. of *naś*).

2.24. But at other times *kṣ* for *kṣy* can hardly be anything but a purely phonetic (or else graphic) matter: *nirīkṣa* LV 341.18 (so all mss.; both edd. *nirīkṣya*; ger.); *asamīkṣa-kāriṇaś* Mv i.90.5 (for *asamīkṣya*, ger., which is read in one inferior ms., out of six).—*antarīkṣa*, as adj., 'atmospheric,' LV 266.1, and *antarikṣa*, ibid., LV 367.7, probably represent Skt. *āntarīkṣa* (or °*ikṣa*, rather than *antarikṣya*, RV., or **āntarīkṣya* or the like).

2.25. Familiar in MIndic, and known to BHS, is *kh* for Skt. *kṣ*, as in *śekheti*, to *śaikṣa*; *khudrāka* = *kṣudraka*; *sukhama*, *sukhuma* = *sūkṣma*; *prākharati* or *prakharati* = *prakṣarati*. There are false Sanskritizations such as *prakhyālana*, for MIndic (Pali) *pakkhāl-*, Skt. *prakṣālana*; and *ukṣa*, for Skt. *ukhā* (Pali and AMg. sporadically *ukkhā*); *akṣaṇa(-vedha)* for Pali *akkhaṇa* = Skt. *ākhaṇa* (Dict.); *saṃkṣayati* (Dict.), perhaps for MIndic *saṃkhāyati* = *saṃkhyāti*. For *kāṃkṣāṃ* Mv i.162.7, two mss., including one of Senart's two best, read *kāṃkhāṃ* (Skt. *kāṅkṣāṃ*). In *lūha* (AMg. id.) = *rūkṣa* we have Prakritic replacement of this *kh* (BHS also *lūkha*) by *h*.

2.26. There is some replacement of *kṣ* by *ṣ*, which perhaps means the same sound as *kh* (cf. the references in Renou, Gr. Scte. p. 4): *saṃpreṣate*, all mss., certainly meaning *saṃprekṣate* (confirmed by Tib.); *praveṣye*, for *pravekṣye*; *abhiniveṣyati*, for °*vekṣyati*, to °*viśati*; in part thru confusion with forms of *śiṣ* (see Dict. s.v. *śiṣyate*), *śiṣyā* = *śikṣā*; *śiṣyāpada* = *śikṣāpada*; *śiṣyāpayati*. A special case is *abhīṣṇaṃ* or *abhiṣṇaṃ* (so all mss.) = *abhīkṣṇaṃ*; the original text evidently had a half-Sanskritized form of the MIndic word found in Pali *abhiṇhaṃ*. And by the converse (hyper-Skt.) process, *prekṣaṇe* = *preṣaṇe* ('sending forth') LV 432.18–19.

2.27. On *kṣ* to *cch* see § 2.18.

Voiced for voiceless stops

2.28. In the manner of Prakrit, BHS occasionally has voiced for Skt. voiceless stops. Pali shows the like sporadically (Geiger 38), sometimes in the same words: so the root *vedh* = Skt. *vyath* appears in both BHS and Pali, but BHS also has *vyadh*; and *niryādayati*, once for *niryāt*° (Pali usually *niyyādeti*). In other cases the BHS forms occur in Pkt. tho not in Pali; but some are peculiar to BHS, so far as my information goes. Sometimes BHS has a Sanskritic form where Pali has a Prakritic one; see *pratikṛtya* (Dict.) for Pali *paṭigacca*. Besides the above I have noted: *śaḍha* (or *saḍha* = AMg. id.) = *śaṭha*; *pradīkṣante* = *pratīkṣante*; *upoṣadha*, *poṣadha*, and derivatives, = Pali (*u*)*posatha* (forms with *dh* are also recorded in Jain Skt.); *daga* = (*u*)*daka*, in *dagodara*; *parijaya* = *paricaya*; *pārājika* (= Pali id.) if this is derived from a form of *parāñc-*; *rugma-(varṇa)* 'gold' = *rukma-*; *uḍaya* (AMg. id.) = *uṭaja*; *utpāda* 'portent' = Pali *uppāda*, Skt. *utpāta*; *upaga* = *upaka* is not purely phonetic, see Dict.

2.29. By hyper-Sktism, or mere corruption, *t* is recorded seemingly for original *d* in *utacchiyam*, Dict.; perhaps also in *pratara* = Pali *patara* for *pradara*. Anomalous, but seemingly acceptable, is *phalikha* (AMg. *phaliha*) = Skt. *parigha*.

v for *p* and *m*, and for *y*

2.30. As in Prakrit, so sporadically in BHS, we find *v* for Skt. *p*. It occurs in quite a group of causative forms, showing *-veti* instead of *-peti* (§§ 38.68–70). Other cases: *pravaṇṇa* = AMg. *pavaṇṇa*, Skt. *prapanna*; *suvarṇa* = *suparṇa*, and *suvarṇin* = *suparṇin*; *anuprāvetsuḥ* (to *anuprāp-*); *vi* perhaps for (*a*)*pi*; *daṇḍavāsika* (Pkt. °*ga*, °*ya*) for Skt. °*pāśika*; *vaiyāvṛtya* regularly for °*pṛtya*, as in Pali *veyyāvacca*; perhaps by hyper-Sktism, *p* for *v* in *pīthī* = *vīthī*, and *prajāpatī* (°*vatī*); also *v* for *m*, *śravaṇa* = *śramaṇa* (and conversely once *śramaṇa* for *śravaṇa*); cf. *Anu-vaineya*, a village of the Maineya people; *saṃvṛti* (hyper-Skt.) = Pali *sammuti* (root *man*).

2.31. Rarely *v* seems to occur for intervocalic *y* (Geiger 46, Pischel 254): *jīvati* = *jīyate* 'is conquered'; *āvusa* (Pali °*so*), *āvus* (? = *āyus*). This is also presupposed by *pubba* = Skt. *pūya*, 'pus', thru **pūva*, **puvva*, with Pali-like change of *vv* to *bb*, according to Senart; but the true reading may be *puvva*, see Dict. Cf. also the ending *āvo* = *āyo*, §§ 1.28; 9.93.

y for intervocalic stop and vice versa

2.32. As regularly in Pkt. and sporadically even in Pali, we find (rarely) *y* for an intervocalic stop: *tāyin*, regularly for Pali *tādin*, AMg. *tāi*; *khāyati*, *khāyita* = *khādati*, *khādita* (as in Pali *khāyita* beside *khādita*); *āchāya* = *āchāda* 'gift'; (*na-*)*yānāti* = (*na*) *jānāti*; *uḍaya* (AMg. id.) = *uṭaja*; *utacchiyam* for *ud-acchidat*(?). In *vipratyanīya*, etc., for °*nīka*, the change of *k* to *y* involves assimilation to suffixal *-īya*.

2.33. By hyper-Sanskritism, and attraction to forms in suffixal *k* (Pkt. *y* or zero), we find *k* for original *y*, in *-bharikā* 'wife', from MIndic *bhariyā* = Skt. *bhāryā*; *harmika* = *harm(i)ya*; *ratanāmikāṃ* 'made of jewels', fem. to **ratanāmaka* = BHS *rat(a)nāmaya*, Pkt. *rayaṇāmaya*, Skt. *ratna-maya*; and for original *j* in *ātmaka* = *ātmaja*.

j for *y* and *y* for *j*

2.34. For *y*, we occasionally (tho rarely) find *j* as in Prakrit, both initially, as in *janta-* = *yantra-*; *jantitā* = *yantritā*; *jakṛt*; *jāpayati* and *jāpanā* = *yāp*°; and medially in *peja* (Pkt. *pejja*) = *peya*; *niryāta* and *nirjāta* are partly blended. By hyper-Sanskritism, or by dialectic Prakritism (Pischel 236), *y* for *j* occurs in *aneya* for Pali *aneja*, and in *sārāyaṇī(ya)*, Dict.; probably also in *Yambhaka*. A bizarre form is *anārjaṃ*, apparently for *anāryaṃ*; see Dict.

Aspirates and *h*

2.35. Sporadically, as also in Pali, *h* is found substituted for aspirate stops, as regularly in Prakrit. So in some compounds of root *dhā*, especially *antar(a)hāyate* etc., also *dahati*, *prahāṇa*; *jalāhara* = *jaladhara*; *gāha* = *gādha*; *lūha* (AMg. id.), also *lūkha*, = Skt. *rūkṣa*; *lahu* etc. = *laghu*; *mohaṃ* = AMg. id., Skt. and Pali *moghaṃ*; *guhmitā*, to Pkt. *gumh-*, Skt. and Pali *gumph-*; *vihu*, for *vidhu* or *vibhu*; *saṃhāta* for *saṃghāta*; *vahati* = *vadhati*. As in Pkt. (Pischel 267), *h* may be replaced by *gh* after nasalization: *saṃghata* = *saṃhata* Gv 55.1.

2.36. By hyper-Sanskritism, *viyūbha* is written for normal BHS *v(i)yūha*, Skt. *vyūha*. But *idha* (Pali id.) is older than Skt. *iha*.

2.37. The Pali form of the word for 'dog', *sunakha*, occurs repeatedly in Mv. It is commonly assumed that *kh* is here a modification of *k*.

ṭ for *ḍ* for Proto-Indic *j*[1] (IE. *ĝ*)?

2.38. Extraordinary interest, but also some dubiety, attaches to the form *bhiṣaṭka*, 'physician', recorded without v.l. thrice in SP, = Skt. *bhiṣaj*, Pali *bhisakka*, BHS once, at least, *bhiṣaṅka* LV 285.1 (vs). The *j* of *bhiṣaj* is historically from IE. *ĝ*, but seems in Vedic and Skt. always to be analogically assimilated to the other *j*, from IE. velar or labiovelar (Wackernagel I pp. 161, 174). If we could rely on *bhiṣaṭka*, were it only as a hyper-Sktism for MIndic *bhisakka*, it would be, to the best of my knowledge, the only record in Indic forms of this word showing the historically expected consonantism. Unfortunately, Senart Mv i note 367, says that for the last two passages cited from SP, the Paris ms. used by Burnouf reads *bhiṣaka* (metrically impossible) and *bhiśaṅka* (intending *bhiṣaṅka*, as in LV 285.1). Yet one cannot help wondering where Kern and Nanjio got their reading *bhiṣaṭka*, allegedly found in all their mss. There seems to be no known Skt. form which could have given a basis for analogical introduction of *ṭ*.

Domal and dental stops and nasals

2.39. Our mss. often write *n* for Skt. *ṇ*, e. g. *śonita* = *śoṇita* LV 262.2, 3 (all mss.); *anumātraṃ* for *aṇu*° LV 261.18 (all mss.; Pali often reads *anu* for *aṇu*, but CPD

calls it a false reading; the Pali vs corresponding to this one, Sn 431, reads *aṇumattena*, with v.l. *anu-*). To some extent this may be due to over-correction of MIndic *ṇ*, which in many dialects replaces Skt. *n*. (So also e. g. BHS and Pali *-poṇa* = Skt. *pavana*.) It may partly be due to errors of tradition. According to Senart Mv i, p. xii note 1, in Nep. mss. *hṇ* and *hn* are indistinguishable; and cf. *ibid.* p. xiv, infra. I have not, in general, collected variants of this sort.

2.40. A case of Prakrit double *ṇṇ* for *nn* is *-pravaṇṇaiḥ* (= *prapannaiḥ*), to be read Mv i.84.3; AMg. *pavaṇṇa*.

2.41. Domal *ṭ* for *t* occurs in *paṭākā* 'banner', well attested, perhaps influenced by *paṭa*; in *vadhya-ghāṭa(ka)* = *-ghāta(ka)*; *ghāṭin*; cf. the vv.ll. *ghāṭetha* at Mv ii.169.6; *ghāṭāpito* 170.15, for *ghāt°* of text; in *samudghāṭayitavya*, *samudghāṭa* and other related words, all for *°ghāt°*, seemingly not paralleled in other dialects; perhaps blended with root *ghaṭ*; for similar changes see Geiger 42, Pischel 218 ff. (but usually where Skt. had *r* in the vicinity).

2.42. As in MIndic, *ṭṭh* sometimes results from assimilation of *st(h)*, by the side of *tth*; see § 2.12.

2.43. Domal for dental due to preceding Skt. *ṛ*, as in MIndic; *vaṭṭa* (Pali id.) = *vṛtta*, and cf. *-ḍaha* below.

2.44. Domal *ḍ* for *d* has been noted in *gaḍā* 'club'; this spelling does not seem to be recorded elsewhere. Also in *(Deva-)ḍaha*, 'pool', for Pali, AMg. *daha*, Skt. *hrada* (Lex. *draha*); the domal *ḍ*, tho historically quite normal, seems to be recorded nowhere else.

2.45. The converse of this, dental *d* for domal *ḍ*, occurs at least once in the mss. of Mv, with *nāda* for regular *nāḍa* or *nāla*. Once, in LV 158.5, acc. to Lefmann all mss. read *kathina* for *kaṭhina* (so Calc.). No such reading seems to be recorded elsewhere.

ḍ (*d*), *l*, and *r*

2.46. Very commonly, domal *ḍ* is written for normal intervocalic Skt. *l*. This reverses the regular Pali change of intervocalic *ḍ* to (domal) *ḷ*. Most of the words which show it are etymologically obscure, and there is nothing to disprove a suggestion that *ḍ* was more original than *l* in them. Only one, *yugala* (for which LV 337.9 has *yugaḍa* in most and the best mss. and Lefm.), seems pretty surely to contain an IE *l* (and even here one might conjecture some influence of the Ap. suffix *ḍa*, Pischel 599). Note also *jaḍa* = *jala* 'water' LV 372.15, but the IE etymology of this word is not certain. Others: *argaḍa* (and *nir-a°*), *āvaḍi*, *upalāḍana*, *upalāḍayati*, *kaḍatra*, *kaḍevara*, *kāḍa*, *gaḍita* (and *vigaḍita*), *cakravāḍa*, *coḍa*, *tāḍa*, *naḍinī*, *nāḍa*, *pravāḍa*, *Baḍi*, *laḍita*, *lāḍita*, *līḍā*, *luḍati*, *viraḍīkṛta* (to *virala*), *vetāḍa*, *vyāḍa* Conversely, *l* appears for Skt. *ḍ* in cpds. of Skt. *ḍī*, 'fly'; see Dict. s.v. 1 *-līyati*.

2.47. There is also confusion between domal *ḍ* and *r*. In Pkt. *paḍi-* (corresponding regularly to Skt. *prati-*) has been shown to occur as replacement for Skt. *pari-*, see Emeneau, JAOS 51.33 ff. I have found a few cases that appear as cpds. of *prati-*, in which BHS itself regularly has *pari-*: *pratinirvāti*, *pratisphuṭa* and *pratiśodhayati* (*°yitavyaṃ*), instead of regular *parinirvāti*, *parisphuṭa*, *pariśodhayati* (these forms occur in the vicinity of the *prati-* forms). With these belongs *prāticāraka* (read *prati°*?), 'attendant', = AMg. *paḍiyāraga*, but Skt. and Pali *pari°*; *paṭipāti* (Pali id.), Skt. *pari°*; perhaps *pratiśrama* = *pari°*. All these may well be Sktized forms of Pktic. **paḍi-*, altered from *pari-*. Perhaps *pariṣṭhita* (for *pratiṣṭhita*, once) shows the reverse change. Note also the variant forms *parihāṭaka* and *°hāraka*, some sort of ornament; they are surely forms of what is fundamentally the same word, and a Pkt. **°hāḍaka* may mediate between them; but popular etymology is likely to be concerned also, cf. Skt. *hāṭaka*, 'gold', and *hāra(ka)*, 'necklace'. In SP 151.9, KN read *-āchoḍita*, 'set, inlaid, covered', which if correct would replace an **āchorita* related to Skt. (KSS.) *āchurita*; but no ms. has the reading of KN, and most of them read *āchādita*, 'covered', which should probably be adopted. WT, however, keep the KN reading; their note cites Tib. as *bris pa* 'painted' or the like.

2.48. The Pali *anamatagga*, Pkt. *aṇavadagga* or *aṇavayagga*, appears regularly in BHS as *anavarāgra*, apparently based on the Pkt. form, with *r* for *d* (influenced by thought of *avara*?).

2.49. Interchange occurs between *r* and *l*, in both directions from the Skt. standpoint. The Dict. will supply references on the following: (*l* for regular Skt. *r*) *aṅkula*, *kala* (= *kara* 'hand'), *Kubela*, *vicālana*, *pañjala*, *pali-* (= *pari-*; various items), *pāṇḍala*, *piñjala* (?), *lujyate* etc., *lūha*, *lūkha* = *rūkṣa*, *valganā* (?), *viśālada*, *śarkalā*, *śikhala*; in several words regularly derived from root *car-*, Laṅk substitutes corresponding forms of *cal-*, which in itself is familiar in Skt. but is not used there in these derivatives; see Dict. s.v. *cal-*; (*r* for regular Skt. *l*) *abhinīra*, *kāra* (= *kāla* 'time') and (derivative) *-kārika*, *vikāra* (s.v. *vikāla*), *tiraka*, *narada*, *paripārayati* (= *°pāl°*), *palvara*, *raghu* = *laghu*, *rajasvara* (= *°la*?), *vatsara*, *varāhaka*, *vargu*, *virolayati*, *śītara*, *śṛgāra*, *sakara*.

Prothetic *v*

2.50. Before weak-grade forms in *u-* from certain roots in *va-*, namely *vac*, *vah*, *vas* 'dwell', and *vap*, a *v* is prefixed, as in MIndic. In my opinion these are blend forms, primarily based on Skt. weak-grade stems (Skt. *uc-* or *uk-*, *uh-*, *uṣ-*, *up-*), but with *v* prefixed by influence from the full-grade (Skt. *vac-* etc.). (Pischel and Geiger have different explanations.) The forms concerned are, in other respects, sometimes straight MIndic, sometimes normal Skt., sometimes neither (imperfectly Sanskritized). They are specially common in Mv but occur sporadically elsewhere (chiefly in verses except for Mv).

2.51. Root *vac*: *vuccati* = *ucyate* (frequently with v.l. *-cy-* for *-cc-*) Mv i.22.8, 9; 26.14; ii.69.4; 240.3; 461.16; 463.16 (twice), etc.; KP 81.14; *vucyati* Mv i.361.21; 362.10; 365.19; *vuccanti* SP 131.6; *vucyanti* Mv i.362.9; iii.92.3; *vucyāmi*, 'I am told', Mv i.362.19; *pravuccati* Mv ii.358.1; *pravuccate* SP 130.4; *pravucyate* SP 255.9; *vutta* = *ukta* Mv ii.437.13 ff.; *saṃpravutta* SP 129.10, 12 (so ed. em., Nep. mss. *saṃpravṛtta*, hyper-Skt., § 3.95); *vukta* KP 14.14; 126.4.

2.52. Root *vah*: *vuhyati* = *uhyate* Mv iii.384.12; *vuhyasi* Mv iii.105.12; *vuhyanti* Mv iii.314.12; *vuhyate* (mss. *°to*) Mv iii.453.15; *vuhyantī* (pple.) Mv iii.166.10; *vuhyantīye* = *uhyantyām* Mv i.342.15; *vuhyantasya* Mv iii.105.8; *vuhyanto* id. 11; *vuhyantaṃ* iii.431.6; *vuhyamānaṃ* iii.424.1.

2.53. Root *vap*: *vutta* = *upta* Mv iii.360.14.

2.54. Root *vas*, 'dwell': *vusta*, ppp. (doubtless an imperfect Sanskritization of the MIndic form exemplified by Pali *vuttha*, 'dwelt'; cf. Epic Skt. *uṣṭa*), prec. by *vāsaṃ* (mss.), Mv iii.433.2; *upavusta* (mss. *opa°*; BHS also *upoṣita*) Mv iii.216.5 (= Pali *upavuṭṭha*, in equivalent vs DN 2.244.3); *āvustaṃ*, so read for *avustaṃ* LV 388.13 (vs, but first syllable metrically indifferent; = Pali *āvuttha*); in Mv iii.185.9 Senart reads *saṃvutthā* (rather n. sg. *°ttho*?), the Pali form (mss. *vusto* or *saṃvutto*); *vustā* Mv iii.325.11 (so mss., may be kept, as gerund, see § 35.52; Senart em. *vusto*).

2.55. Senart assumes *vūdagra* = *udagra* Mv i.83.8 and 154.7. But in 83.8 the mss. read *anantavud°*, which I believe means *anantav'(ān) ud°*; in 154.7 they read *bhava ud°* (without any *v*). Meter requires long initial syllable both times; read, doubtless, *ūdagra* m.c. But there is no reason to assume prothetic *v*.

Sibilants

2.56. Interchange between the three sibilants is common even in Skt. mss. Especially between *ś* and *s*, in both directions, it is very much commoner in BHS; so common that it would be fruitless to collect many examples, especially since corruptions in tradition are very much to be suspected in this case. They are generally ignored even in the Dict. A few examples only are here cited.

2.57. *ś* for regular Skt. *ṣ*: *pariveśitum* and °*śakair* Divy 86.18 and 20, for °*veṣ*°; *anuśaktam* Divy 422.14, mss., for °*ṣak*° (so ed. em.); *samudeśyate* Śikṣ 102.10, 12; 103.7, for *samudeṣyate* (fut. of *sam-ud-i*), cited from Gv 482.16, 18; 483.2, where text *samuddeṣyate*, *samudeṣyate* (2d ed. °*dveṣyate*), and *samuddiśyate*, respectively.

2.58. *ś* for regular Skt. *s*: (in forms and derivatives of root *sru* common even in Skt.) *praśravanti* LV 76.16 (all mss. and both edd.); 251.7, 8; *mṛdukasugandhaśravā(sya)* LV 49.20; *āśrava* (see Dict.) is perhaps the prevalent spelling for the equivalent of Pali *āsava*, e. g. *anāśrava* LV 242.11; *pāṃśu* LV 74.16; 190.15; *śūkṣma* LV 163.3; 395.20 (here both edd. *sū*°, but all Lefm.'s mss. *śū*°); 422.15 (here both edd. with all mss. *śū*°); Mv i.158.9; *(niḥ)śaraṇa* LV 175.2 (here Lefm. em. °*sar*°); 180.14, 15; 346.2; *apāśya* = *apāsya*, 'getting rid of', LV 48.7; *adhyavaśitāḥ* = °*sitāḥ* LV 207.7 (all mss.).

2.59. *ṣ* for regular *ś* (not very common): *-kileṣāṃ* = *kleśān* LV 164.9 (all mss. but one); *kṛṣāṅga-* = *kṛś*° LV 188.8 (all mss.); *parāmṛṣati*, 'touches', = °*mṛś*° Mv i.284.5; *parāmṛṣya* Mv ii.412.5 (twice).

2.60. *ṣ* for regular *s* (rare): *nyaṣīt* LV 271.19 (all mss.), 'set down, provided' = *nyasīt* (so only Calc.; aor. of *ni-as*); more doubtful is *niraṣṭa*, ppp., Dict.; *avabhāṣāḥ* = °*sāḥ* Divy 92.29. Note that *ṣ* is not usually substituted for Skt. *s* after *e*, *o* when these are MIndic for *aya*, *ava*. But occasionally this substitution seems to occur; see Dict. s.v. *oṣita*, apparently for *avasita*; *kīrteṣu* (*atītān*, so divide with WT and Tib.) SP 63.9.

2.61. A special case is *ṣṭ* for *st*, in *anu(t)traṣṭāḥ* = *anuttrastāḥ*, 'unafraid', LV 12.16 (both edd., no v.l.); *aṣṭaṃga*, n. of the western mountain (Skt. *asta-*, Pali *atthaṃga*) LV 390.8, prob. used here for the sake of word play on *aṣṭam artham* in the next line (*aṣṭa*, ppp. of *aś*, attain); see Dict.

2.62. *s* for regular *ṣ* (not very common): *śaknosi* for °*ṣi* Divy 129.2, 13; 279.23; *bhesyanti* Śikṣ 45.12; 47.9; *bhesyāmo* 46.16; *bhavisyāmo* 46.18, all for °*ṣy*° (fut.). A hyper-Sanskritism, which reverses the process of § 2.61, is found in *vusta* for Skt. *uṣṭa*, § 2.54.

2.63. *s* for regular *ś* (extremely common): *(a)drsu* (to *dṛś*) LV 27.22; *yoniso* LV 37.12; *vasa-* = *vaśa-* LV 45.11; Mv i.156.1; *vasam* Mv i.129.1; *vesma* LV 49.7; *sayānāṃ* LV 56.19; *-yasā(ḥ)* LV 59.4; *āsā* = *āśā* LV 65.2; 221.21; 222.22; Mv i.156.18; *suṅgībhūta* LV 76.10; *nasyet* LV 81.19; *nikāsa* LV 92.12; *sabala* LV 95.1; *niḥsvasati* = *niḥśvasati* LV 103.22 (all mss.); 104.2 (most and best mss.); 104.4 (best mss., but majority °*śvas*°; Lefm. °*śvas*° all three times); *socamī* = *śocāmi* LV 111.7; *mahāsāla* LV 117.17; *siri* = *śrī* LV 122.16, 18, and often; *sobhate* LV 122.19; *sobhami* LV 137.16; *sītibhāvaḥ* LV 125.3; *vyupasamād* LV 129.3; *sāntam* LV 153.18; *samatha* LV 156.5; 181.19; *sākiya* = *Śākya* LV 133.5; 135.7; *svaśrau* . . . *svaśure* LV 139.11 and *svaśrūṃ* . . . *svaśuraṃ* 157.11; *pṛsiṣyati* LV 153.18; *soṣiṣye* = *śoṣ*° LV 164.8; *sveta-* LV 188.8; *prasnāna* = *praśnānāṃ*, so read with nearly all mss. for *pramlāna* (false em.) LV 370.16; *vāsīhi*, to *vāśī*, 'ax', (but *vāsī* sometimes is read in Skt.) Mv i.5.4; *sunakhā*, 'dogs', Mv i.15.1 etc.; *sarad(a)* Mv i.74.8; *saṃkā* Mv i.151.5 = 224.16 = ii.27.16 (in the last Senart reads *śaṅkā* with one ms.); *vāgīsena* (: *īśa*) Mv i.163.12; *sisya* Mv i.305.18.

Nasals and anusvāra

2.64. There is much confusion in writing between the anusvāra sign, which I transliterate *ṃ*, and both *m* and *n*, especially final, but also in medial position before consonants. In endings, *n* is also written for historic *m*, and vice versa (next §). When a consonant follows, or in absolutely final position, I cannot discover any evidence of real linguistic significance in these variations. They seem to be purely random and meaningless. Before vowels, on the other hand, we shall see that final *m* (or *n*) was not interchangeable with *ṃ*; the latter made a syllable closed and hence metrically long. (The mss. also sometimes write *ṃm*, which seems to me only a typical careless writing. I doubt its correspondence to any phonetic reality, such as is assumed, solely on this ground, by H. Smith [see my § 1.38, fn. 15], p. 3.) But this occurs only at the end of words, not internally. There is, however, no evidence in our texts suggesting differences between what are called 'nasalized vowels', anusvāra, and anunāsika (cf. Wackernagel I.1 §§ 223–4; Pischel 178 ff.). We shall use the single term anusvāra and write *ṃ*; to do anything else would be purely subjective and speculative.

2.65. The regular replacement in MIndic of final nasals by anusvāra (§ 2.68), except sometimes before an initial vowel, leads in BHS now and then to final *n* instead of *m*, and vice versa, at least in the orthography of the mss. Cf. JAOS 66.202 (§ 51). So *śraddhān* LV 294.17 (end of a line) for *śraddhām*; *ramantān* LV 43.6 (end of a line) for *ramantām*, 3 pl. impv.; *tām* (for *tān*, sc. *adhyāśayān*) *udāhare* Mv i.77.6 (Senart reads *tāṃ*, without ms. authority; some mss. *tāṃm*); *dīpyantām* (mss., before *i-*) Mv ii.28.6, for °*tān*, acc. pl. masc. In Mv i.169.18; 170.5 Senart regards *kalpakotīm asaṃkhyeyāṃ* as acc. pl., but they may be acc. sg.: 'for a numberless crore of kalpas'?

2.66. A reflex of anusvāra for nasal consonants may be the frequent writing (here generally ignored as purely orthographic and sporadic, and linguistically meaningless) of *n* for Skt. anusvāra, in such words as *mānsa* Mv i.7.6; LV 49.22 etc.; *pānsu* Mv i.94.16, and often; also *hansye* = *haṃsye*, fut. of *han*, LV 311.18. Cf. Senart i p. xvi, and JAOS 66.202 (§ 51).

2.67. In this same place Senart notes the frequent occurrence of *t* for anusvāra (or BHS *n*) before *s*, which he nowhere accepts in his edition, writing always *n* (for either *n* or *t* of mss.), or *ṃ*. Senart suggests that this *t* for *n* before *s* may be merely a graphic error, but adds nevertheless that it may be connected with the Vedic development of *t* between internal *n* and *s*. It may occur in any word containing Skt. *ṃs*, as *mātsa* = *mānsa* = Skt. *māṃsa*, v.l. in Mv iii.269.8; *vihatsyase*, to be read with best mss. for Lefm. *vibhartsyase* (em.) LV 335.1 (Skt. *vihaṃsyase*, fut. of *vi-han*; § 31.24). It is extremely common in 3 pl. aorist forms in *-tsu(ḥ)* for *-nsu(ḥ)* and *-ṃsu(ḥ)*; for these Senart, wrongly as it seems to me, never admits the reading *-tsu(ḥ)* in his text. It is less common, but occurs sporadically, in other texts than Mv. See §§ 32.96 ff.

2.68. As in MIndic generally, anusvāra is often used instead of any final nasal. This seems to be more than a merely orthographic matter. For it occurs before vowels, in what must have been close juncture, and in prose as well as verse. In prose it is, to be sure, chiefly Mv that writes anusvāra before vowels: *yaṃ asti* i.3.13; *abhūtaṃ abhyākhyānaṃ* 45.11; *prathamaṃ adāsi* 48.15, etc. (very common). But note also *gacchaṃ* (= *gacchan*) *upakārī bhavati* Bbh 31.19—20, prose (for normal Skt. *gacchann*; close juncture), in a text which on the whole is quite thoroughly Sanskritized; and elsewhere.

2.69. Most texts make use of this practice in verses for metrical convenience. It is absolutely standard practice in all verses to use final *m* before a following initial vowel

if meter requires a short final syllable, but ṃ if a long is required. No editor has seen this clearly; all editions are confused and inconsistent in this respect. So are the mss. to some extent; but they follow the rule in an overwhelming majority of instances, and there can be no question of its original validity; the exceptions are mere corruptions of tradition.

2.70. Examples are found everywhere in great abundance. A few are cited JAOS 66.202 (§ 50); I add here a few more, which might be multiplied indefinitely. In all the following, meter clearly demands a long syllable where final ṃ is written before a vowel: SP *duḥkhaṃ idaṃ* 86.9, 14; *trāṇaṃ aham* 90.3; *ekaṃ imu* 90.10; *sūtraṃ abhi°* 93.4; *sūtraṃ imaṃ* 93.7; *sūtraṃ idam* 94.1; *tvaṃ ida* (for *idaṃ*; v.l. *ima*) 97.14; *sūtraṃ upa-* 98.8; *kalpaṃ ahu* 99.5; LV, *paramaṃ ud-* 43.11; *ratnākaraṃ a-* 45.18 (so all mss. but one; Lefm. *°karam a-*, unmetrical); *pithituṃ a-* 46.7; *pūjārahaṃ atiśayam* (no v.l., but meter proves *°yaṃ* must be read) *abhi-* 47.9; *vyākaraṇaṃ ṛṣeḥ* 111.14; *paraṃ aśokaṃ* 163.19; *tvaṃ adīna-* 170.15; Mv, *divyanayanaṃ ani-* i.66.4 (mss. *divyaṃ nay°*, unmetrical, em. Senart); *nirvṛtiṃ upa-* 66.9; *taṃ a-* 82.11, 12; *asaṃghaṃ idam uvāca* 112.2 (both ṃ and m metrically correct); *nirbhayaṃ idaṃ* 177.6; *śaraṇaṃ upenti* 256.4 (one ms. *śaraṇam*, unmetrical); *satataṃ alaṃkṛto* ii.44.16; Dbh.g., *satataṃ a-* 7(343).16; *atuliyaṃ a-* 11(347).9; Sukh, *āgatya ca* (read *cā* or *co*) *kṣetram idaṃ udāraṃ* 52.15.

2.71. Not only is the variation between final ṃ and m, before vowels, utilized for metrical purposes. Furthermore, as in Pali and Pkt. (cf. Geiger 32.2; Pischel 181, 182, 350), a final nasal (very rarely a non-final, § 2.73) may be lost, or unhistorically added (i. e. a final vowel may be nasalized). This is certainly connected with the rule of Pāṇini 8.4.57 which permits optional nasalization before a pause of any absolutely final *a*, *i*, or *u* vowel, long or short. It seems to have been characteristic of MIndic generally (except that MIndic had no long nasalized vowels). Only scant traces of 'spontaneous' nasalization are found in our Skt. records (Wackernagel I § 259), despite Pāṇini. In BHS both loss and addition of final nasalization occur chiefly in verses, being utilized for metrical convenience. It must be noted, further, that some secondary final nasalizations are due, at least in part, to morphological analogies rather than phonetic developments. This is also true in MIndic; such nasalizations of final vowels as are illustrated by Pali *manaṃ*, *tiriyaṃ* etc. (= Skt. *manāk*, *tiryak*; Geiger 66, end) are clearly assimilated to adverbial forms in final *-aṃ*.

Loss of final (rarely internal) nasal

2.72. Loss of final nasal occurs in many endings, usually m.c.: in the acc. sg. m. and n.-acc. nt. of *a*-stems (§§ 8.31 ff.), and the acc. sg. of consonantal stems (e. g. §§ 17.55; 18.83); in pronominal forms such as *mahya*, *iya*, *ida* (§§ 20.27; 21.79); in 1st person verb endings, such as aor. *abhūva* and opt. *pravadeya* (§§ 32.109; 29.29). Also in indeclinables: *katha* SP 314.4; LV 233.4; *eva* = *evaṃ*; *evarūpa* = *evaṃrūpa* is very common, and occurs even in the prose of LV, as well as of Mv (and of Pali). In SP 71.3, prose, KN print *ātmāna*, which WT em. to *ātmanaḥ* (the next word is *saṃjānatāṃ*), but *ātmānaṃ* (acc. sg.) may quite as well be intended, with denasalization. I suspect a misprint, however.

2.73. Denasalization for the sake of meter in the interior of a word is extremely rare, but I think it must be recognized in Mv i.305.21, where (as Senart's note indicates, tho his text reads *iṃjitena*) we must read *prāsādiken' ijitena*, m.c. for *iñjitena*. (The mss. have *°kena ijitena* or *°kenejitena*; they agree in lacking the nasal.) It must be noted, however, that nasalless forms of this root are recorded where meter cannot be concerned; see Dict. s.vv. *ānijya*, *iñjate*.

Addition of final nasal

2.74. Conversely, a final anusvāra may be added unhistorically as a means of lengthening the syllable, equivalent to lengthening of the vowel or doubling the following initial consonant ('law of morae', §§ 3.1–4). So, in verses, metri causa: *mam' ihaṃ* (= *iha*) *śṛṇohi* SP 94.2; *naṃ hi* LV 329.22 (v.l. *na hi*, unmetrical); *sādhuṃ* (= *sādhu*) *ti* SP 55.12; *suṣṭhuṃ khalu* (read *khalū* with WT and ms. K') SP 114.10; *śirī ham asmiṃ manujeṣu saṃmatā* Mv ii.57.2, 'I am glory, highly regarded among men' (*asmiṃ* = *asmi* 'I am'; so mss., Senart em. *asmi*, unmetrically); repeated with *śraddhāham asmiṃ* 57.18; *diviṃ* (= *divi*) *gataḥ* (or *gatāḥ*) Mmk 618.26; 625.7; 627.14; *anubhūya diviṃ sukham*, 'having experienced bliss in heaven', Mmk 629.16 (here only a loc. is construable, proving that we should not emend *diviṃ*, q.v. in Dict., in the other cases to *divaṃ*); in these Mmk passages always in verses where meter requires a long, hence likely to be m.c.; *paratraṃ ca* Ud vii.6 (later ms. *paratrāsau*; possibly the ending of *paraṃ* may have contributed some blending influence).

2.75. And in the seam of cpds.: *daśandiśāsu*, v.l. of Kashgar rec. SP 194.9 for ed. *daśaddiśāsu*; *citrakathāṃ bahuṃvidhāṃ*, Kashgar rec., SP 283.13, for Nep. mss. *citrakathān bahūṃś ca* (note masc. endings!), em. in both edd. to *°kathā bahūś ca*; *kṛśaṃtanuḥ*, 'lean-bodied', LV 157.21 (Calc. *kṛṣatanuḥ*, unmetr., without ms. support in Lefm.); *svetaṃśiro* LV 188.8 (all mss.; Calc. *śvetaśirāḥ*, unmetr.); *mīḍhaṃgirī* LV 197.3, 'mountains of dung', (ms. A intends *mīḍhaggirī*; most mss. *mīḍhagirī*, unmetr.); *ugraṃteja-* LV 221.2 (most mss. *ugrateja-*, unmetr.); *aṭavi-puraṃ-prakāśaṃ* LV 231.3 (so read, as cpd., 'having the appearance of a jungle-town'); *kṣayaṃniruddhā(ḥ)* (so read, as cpd.; no possible construction for separate *kṣayaṃ* as Lefm. prints it) LV 420.14; *dhutaṃguṇa* Śikṣ 328.2 = *dhutaguṇa*; *saṃparivāram* Śikṣ 343.15 for *sa-p°*, m.c.; *śīlaṃśrutajñānasusthito* KP 36.7 (m.c. for *śīla-śruta-*, pronounced *°suta-*, or at least with single initial cons.); *dharmacakraratanaṃpurojavā* Gv 54.16 (so read, as one cpd. word; text prints *purojavā* separately); *coraṃbhayā*, 'dangers from thieves', Gv 213.12; *trimalaṃtamoharaṃ* Gv 482.23 (text *trimalaṃ*, as separate word, *ta°*, which is senseless), but the line is cited Śikṣ 103.2 with *trimalat-tamo-* (doubling of initial cons., §§ 2.78 ff.); *sphaṭikaṃmayam* Laṅk 308.1, 'made of quartz or crystal', so read with all mss. (ed. *°ka-mayam*, unmetr.); not strictly a cpd. since *-maya* is better called a suffix, but of the same essential character.

2.76. Such forms seem to occur in prose only in close compounds in which the prior member originally ended in a consonant or a long vowel. In other words, these cases are applications of the 'law of morae' by which, without regard to meter, internal nasalized vowel may be substituted for long vowel or for short vowel plus consonant cluster (double consonant). Examples: *-mātraṃjñātā* (read *°jñatā*?) LV 430.3–4, for *mātrajña(tā*, which also occurs), Skt. **mātrā-jña(tā)*, Pali *mattaññutā*; *mahaṃgata(-tā)* for *mahadgata* (which also occurs), Pali *mahaggata*. See § 3.4 for similar cases in the interior of words.

Double and single consonants; loss of final consonants

2.77. By the 'law of morae' (§§ 3.1–4a), in our language as in MIndic generally, double consonant after short vowel may interchange with single consonant after long or nasalized vowel. As a corollary to this, in metrical passages, doubling of a consonant (unhistorically) is employed where a long syllable is required, on a par with lengthening or

nasalization of a short vowel.[1] In our language, which in this respect seems to differ from the general run of MIndic, such unhistorical doubling of consonants seems to occur only when meter requires a long syllable, and is furthermore very nearly limited to word-final plus initial position, including, of course, the seam between parts of compounds. It is balanced by a corresponding simplification of double consonants.

2.78. Consonant, generally initial, doubled after short preceding vowel, m.c.: *so caj jino* SP 25.11, read thus (or, *so co jino*) for KN *sā co jino* (em.; text *jano*); WT *so co jino* with their ms. K′; all KN's mss. are reported as reading *ca* (unmetrical) except one *caj*; the same reading must be adopted SP 193.3 and 9 (both edd. *so cā jino*, without ms. support), as well as in SP 68.7 where both edd. read *so caj-* (tho the mss. vary); same also Samādh 8.28; *so cat tahī* SP 294.5, read thus with 3 mss., both edd. *cā* with 1 ms.; *kadāci pij* (= *api*) *jāti-* SP 48.8, read thus with WT and all Nep. mss. for KN °*pi*° (unmetrical).

2.79. Common in many texts is *daśad-diśā-* (*-diśi*, etc.); the mss. and editions show inconsistencies, but the overwhelming weight of evidence proves that when a long syllable is required in this combination, even if the mss. read *daśa-di*°, doubling of the *d* is to be assumed. A few examples: *daśad-diśāsu* SP 32.14; 194.9 (Kashgar rec. *daśand*°); 222.3; 251.2; Gv 475.19, 21; Dbh.g. 29(55).25 (so, acc. to note, Tib. and Chin.; mss. *śatad-diśāsu*); *daśad-diśe* SP 190.13; 217.13; *daśad-diśi* Bhad 1, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 47; Śikṣ 259.14; Gv 57.21, 23; 215.6, 13; 230.21; 254.25, etc.; also *daśasud-diśāsu* (= *daśasu di*°) SP 55.11; 207.11 (here KN *daśasu di*° without v.l., unmetr., but WT *-dd-* with their ms. K′); 222.7. The unmetrical *daśa-diśaḥ* of Gv 34.14 is, therefore, probably to be read *daśad-diśaḥ*; but *daśā-diśaḥ* would also be possible, of course, as in LV 219.13.

2.80. In LV 197.3 text *mīḍhaṃgirī*, v. l. (ms. A) intends *mīḍhaggirī*, both = *mīḍhagirīn*, 'mountains of dung'; in Śikṣ 103.2 *trimalattamopahaṃ* (so read for ed. °*pyahaṃ*) = *trimala-tamo*°, in citation from Gv 482.23 which reads *trimalaṃ*-(in ed. separated from the following)-*tamoharaṃ* (nasalization instead of doubling of consonant); *Sarvajjagābhimukharūpa* Gv 285.9 (2d ed. *Sarvaja*°, unmetr.; n. of a Jina, = *Sarvajagadabhi*°); *triyadhvanayappāthesu* (misprinted °*ṣpatheṣu*) Gv 313.26 (= *tryadhvanayapath-*).

2.81. When the initial consonant is a sibilant, it may be doubled by itself, as in *kaṇṭakabhasmatṛṇaśśayanānām* Śikṣ 332.7 (from Ratnolkādhāraṇī), for °*tṛṇa-śay*°, 'of those making their beds on thorns, ashes, or grass'. More often, visarga is written before the sibilant. The two spellings obviously have essentially the same linguistic meaning. *hantaḥ* (= *hanta*, interjection) *śṛṇuṣva* LV 200.6 (so text, correctly, with ms. A only; most mss. *hanta*, unmetr.); *diśo daśaḥ sarva bhaveyu pūrṇā* SP 32.2, 'if all the ten directions were filled'; all mss. *daśaḥ*, kept by WT but explained as f. nom. pl. (!); KN em. *daśa* (unmetr.); *jinaḥsakāse* LV 393.9, so (or °*śe*) read with best mss. (Lefm. *jinasakāse*, unmetr.); *buddhaḥśatāḥ* LV 421.17, so read with best mss. (Lefm. *buddhaśatā*, unmetr.); *-śataḥsahasrā* Dbh.g. 41(67).15 (m.c. for *-śatasah*°); *dharmaḥsamudra-* Gv 314.7 (m.c. for *dharmasam*°).

2.82. In the middle of words, I have noted *samuddita*, seemingly m.c. for *samudita* (Dict.), and otherwise only *ṛjju* for *ṛju*; in Mv ii.63.15 the reading indicated somewhat corruptly by the mss. is certainly *asaṭh'* (or *asaḍh'*? mss. *asadh'*) *ṛjjubhūto*; and in Mv ii.80.13 for the unmetrical *ṛjubhūtaḥ* we should doubtless read *ṛjju*°. But Pali *ujju* (beside *uju*) seems not to be limited to occurrence m.c.

2.83. Different in character is the writing of *yy* after *e*, as often in Pali. This is nothing but a special case of the 'law of morae'; long *e* plus *y* is replaced by short *e* plus *yy*, but long and short *e* are written alike. Hence the writing of *-eyya* etc. in optative endings, regular in Pali (and in Pkt. changed to *-ejja* etc.), and sporadic in BHS, § 29.30. Similarly *peyya*, 'beverage' = Pali id., Skt. *peya*.

2.84. Reduction of double to single consonants. The reverse of such doubling, namely reduction of a double to a single consonant, also occurs in verses m.c. In my judgment, we must include here not only cases in which a Sanskrit double consonant is thus reduced, like *utapta* for *uttapta*; but also those in which Sanskrit would have a cluster of dissimilar consonants, which only by MIndic assimilation would be alike (or different at most in that the second may be aspirated), as in *upīḍa* for MIndic *uppīḍ*°, Skt. *utpīḍa*. In other words, I assume that such a form as *upīḍa* can be understood only as derived directly from a MIndic *uppīḍa*, not from the Skt. *utpīḍa*. That MIndic treatment of consonants underlies our dialect is suggested by its sporadic appearance even in orthography, shown above. It is more impressively demonstrated by the obvious metrical structure of the verses, in which what is usually written as a consonant cluster was nevertheless regularly pronounced as a single consonant, since a preceding syllable ending in a short vowel is prosodically short (§ 2.2).

2.85. Such reduction occurs at least sporadically, and apparently only m.c., in Pali (Geiger 32.2, end). Fairly common is Pali *dukha* for *dukkha* (see Childers s.v. *dukkho*); to be sure the analogy of *sukha* may have helped, but *dukha* seems to occur only metri causa. Our language also has *dukha*, sometimes written so, sometimes written *duḥkha* but shown by meter to have been pronounced *dukha*; also *dukhin*, *dukhita*.

2.86. Other examples (all vss, m.c.): Compounds of Skt. *nis-*: *niguṇa* for *nirg*°, i. e. MIndic *nigg*°; *vinigata* for *vinirg*° (Pali *viniggata*); *nikaruṇa* for *niṣk*°, Pali *nikk*°; *nisaṃśayaṃ* = *niḥsaṃśayam*; *nimūlayitum* = *nirm*°; *nisattva* = *niḥs*°; *vinibhāga* (but in prose *vinirbhāga*); *nivyāpara*, pronounced *nivā*°, for *nirvyāpāra*.

2.87. Forms of *darś-*, MIndic *dass-* (or *daṃs-*), appearing as *daś-* with single *ś*: *dinadaśi* must be read LV 362.13, with several mss. including A, the best (text *dinadarśi*, unmetr.); in Mv i.43.12 = 242.22 read (*akhaṇḍam acchidram akalmaṣ' avraṇaṃ*) *vyākare arthadaśī* (mss. °*darśī*, unmetrical) *matīmāṃ*; *daśayi* Dbh.g. 42(68).19, for *darśayi*, which is an unmetrical v.l.

2.88. Compounds containing Skt. *ud-*: *upala* prob. = *utpala*; *utiṣṭha*, to be read LV 397.1 and 10 with best ms. A, for *uttiṣṭha* of other mss. and both edd.; *upīḍa* for *utpīḍa*; read *upādo* Samādh 19.22 and *upanno* 19.25, for text with mss. *utpādo*, *utpanno* (unmetr.); so also read *upa*° for unmetr. *utpannu*, °*no*, °*naḥ*, Gv 254.24; 255.2, 3; *samupādayetsuḥ*, *samupādanīyam*, for *samutp*°; in Śikṣ 103.3 text unmetrically *samujjvālayiṣyati*, perhaps read *samujāl*°, but Gv 482.24, whence Śikṣ cites the line, reads in ed. corruptly *dharmadīpa maitrayu* (2d ed. °*pa-matrayu*) *jāl*°, possibly for *dharmadīpam ayu jāl*°, where *jāl*° is for Skt. *jvāl*°; the corrupt ms. of Śikṣ also contains *maitra-ya*, which spoils the meter; *ayu* or *aya* = *ayam* seems the only possible reading; *maitra* perhaps got in by error from the preceding line; Tib., cited in note to Śikṣ, supports

1. The corresponding MIndic conditions are perhaps best set forth in Geiger 5, 6, 24 (but I question the pertinence of word-accent, which Geiger assumes here), 32, 33; in the seam of compounds some such cases (*anuddayā*, *paṭikkūla*, etc.) seem to me due to analogical influence (JAOS 41.462 ff.).

some form or cpd. of *jvālayati*; *utapta* (also °*ta-vatī*) = *uttapta*.

2.89. Miscellaneous: *tiryaggata* and °*ti* occur several times with single *g*, m.c. (Dict. s.v. *tirya*); *śayāto*, 'from the bed', abl. to *śayyā*; *visandati* = Pali *vissa*°, Skt. *viṣya*°; *madharmaṃ* RP 17.15, Finot's em. for ms. *mudharmaṃ* (assumed to be m.c. for *maddh*°, and reported to be confirmed by Chin.); read *sadharmaṃ* Bhad 26 with several good mss. (ed. *sāddharmaṃ*, so!) for *sad-dh*°; read *tanimnaḥ* Śikṣ 106.13 for ed. *tannimnaḥ*, unmetr.; *catutha* = *caturtha*; *kama* = *karma*(*n*), MIndic *kamma*; *budhita*, see Chap. 43, s.v. *budh* (2), for *buddhita*; *bhajiṣyati*, see ib. s.v. 2 *bhaj* (2); (*a*)*thi*, to be read in LV 46.18 with 2 mss., for MIndic *atthi* = Skt. *asti*: *pratipūrṇa thi ye*, 'who are filled (with all virtues)'; the only other metrically possible reading in the mss. is *si ye* (meaning?); Lefm.'s em. *siddhye* is impossible. (In the preceding line read certainly *nirvṛti ye*, sc. *icchanti*.)

2.90. Dropping of final consonants. The dropping of any final consonant other than a nasal, regular in MIndic, is common in the writing of BHS, in verses of all texts, when meter demands that the final syllable be short. It also occurs commonly in the prose of Mv, and occasionally in metrically indifferent positions in verses of other texts. Many examples will be found in the morphology, where a Skt. final consonant of an inflectional form is often dropped. This leads, for example, to the creation of new vocalic stems, based on consonantal stems from which the stem-final consonant (also word-final in the n. sg.) was lost, as *jaga-* from Skt. *jagat-*, § 15.2, *tirya* from *tiryañc*, *tiryak*, etc.

2.91. Such cases may be supplemented here by a few examples, out of very many, of indeclinables in which a final consonant is lost. So in prose in Mv: *puna* i.5.9; 349.3; *yāva* i.18.14; 20.4; *kāni ci* i.328.8; *kasya ci* i.364.7, etc.; and in verses, *paścā* = *paścāt* (see Dict.) ii.391.2; *punāyaṃ* iii.367.2 (so mss., to be kept; for *punar ayam*). And in verses of other texts, almost always where meter demands a short final syllable: *tāva* SP 92.10; 355.9 (here in a metrically indifferent position); *kaś ci* SP 34.10; 93.1; Samādh 8.25; LV 37.21; *kā ci* SP 126.9; LV 36.16; Suv 40.12; *ke ci* Samādh 19.23; Bhad 1, 14, 15; *kadā ci* SP 96.2, 8; Suv 61.1; *kva ci* Suv 40.8; RP 4.3; *kutra ci* Suv 51.5; *paśca* (-*kāle*, cf. *paścā* above) Samādh 8.31; *puna* LV 12.7; Samādh 22.6, and in SP 284.1 read *puna* for *punar*, m.c. (unless the quite different reading of the Kashgar rec. be adopted); *dhi* = *dhik* SP 351.6 (read *hā hā dhi muṣyanti hi sarvasattvā*); *samya* = *samyak* Dbh.g. 20(356).15.

2.92. The loss of final *s* or its saṃdhi equivalent (*r*, visarga, etc.) is so common, and so abundantly illustrated in the morphology, that it hardly needs illustration here. (See e. g. §§ 8.22; 10.15; 16.31, etc.) It is by no means limited to cases of metrical convenience, tho extensively utilized in verses for such purposes. Even in prose, and even before vowels, such cases are frequent, particularly in the Mv, but also elsewhere. Note e. g. *babhūvatu* (3 dual perf.) *uttara-* Divy 435.4 (prose; no v.l.). According to Speyer's note on Av i.16.11 (prose), the mss. of that text regularly write *catu-ṛddhipāda* which Speyer always emends to *caturṛddhi*°.

2.93. On the other hand, the following cases are evidently to be interpreted as use of final visarga, even before a vowel or a voiced consonant, to make the syllable closed and therefore prosodically long as required by meter, just as a final nasal may be changed to anusvāra under the same circumstances and for the same reason (§ 2.74): *lalitagatiḥ anavadyagātrasaṃdhiḥ* Mv i.205.4 = ii.8.18 (so Senart with both mss. the first time and one of them the second time, where the other reads °*gati ana*°, unmetrically; same line LV 55.8 *lalitagatir dṛḍhavajra*°); *kalpaḥvikalpāpagato* KP 136.7, where *kalpaḥ-* (in a cpd.) certainly represents a metrical lengthening for *kalpa-* (more often this is accomplished by lengthening the stem-final vowel, *kalpā-* or *kalpo-*, or doubling the following initial consonant, *kalpav-vi*°, or nasalization of vowels; see above).

3. Phonology, Vowels

'Law of morae'

3.1. The excellent statement on this subject in Geiger 5, 6 reveals that to some extent MIndic shows what look like free variations between long vowel plus single consonant, nasalized vowel plus single consonant, and short vowel plus double consonant. Occasional, tho relatively few, cases of this sort are recorded in BHS. Thus:

3.2. Long vowel for short before original consonant cluster: *vāka*, 'bark', (Pali id.) for **vakka* = Skt. *valka*; *nīharati* = Pali id., Skt. *nirharati*; *veṭh-ayati* etc. must be interpreted as for **vĕṭṭh-* = Skt. *veṣṭ-*, with lengthening of the *e* originally shortened before a MIndic double consonant; *timīsaka*, 'dark', appears to be based on MIndic (AMg.) *timissa* = Skt. *tamisra*; *purākṛta* = *puraskṛta*, Pali *purakkhata*; BHS *yātaka*, *tātaka* (also °*uka*; *yāttaka*, *tāttaka* may be blends) are unparalleled elsewhere, and perhaps belong here as representing the equivalent forms *yattaka*, *tattaka* (= Pali id.). Probably here belong also *ūhata*, *ūhanati*, and *sam-ūh-*. See also § 3.73.

3.3. Long vowel for nasalized vowel: *sāhartavya* = *saṃh*°; *maitrāsa-tā* for **maitrāṃśa(tā)*, MIndic °*aṃsa*°, *maitra* plus *aṃśa*, see Dict.; *abhisāhita*, prob. for *abhisaṃhita*; *sārajyati* = *saṃr*°; *sālekhika* to *saṃlekha*; *sārambha* and *sālambha*; *sārāyaṇī(ya)*; *rājanīya* = *rañj*°; *gābhīra-tā*, probably for *gambh*°; *pīṣati* etc., for *piṃṣ-*; if Pali *Vaṅgīsa*, n. pr., is more orig. than BHS *Vāgīśa*, the latter would be an etymologizing hyper-Sktism. Also *ū* occurs once for the infinitive ending *uṃ*; *voḍhū* (= *voḍhuṃ*) *yatas te na dhuraṃ samarthāḥ* KP 82.9 (vs). Or is this to be regarded as a lengthening m.c. of *voḍhu* = *voḍhuṃ*? Cf. the apparent (tho rare) use of *ū* in the n. sg. m. of *a*-stems, which seems to be a lengthening of *u*, itself a reduction of *o*, § 8.21.

3.4. Nasalized vowel for short vowel plus double consonant, or long vowel plus single consonant: *puṃgala* = *pudgala* (Pali *puggala*); *vaṅka* (Pali id.) for *vakka* (also Pali) = Skt. *vakra*; *muṅga* = *mudga*; *maṅku* (= Pali id.) = *maṅgu* = *madgu* (if this is the original form); *bhiṣaṅka*, 'physician', = Pali *bhisakka*, BHS *bhiṣatka* (§ 2.38); *alambu*, or *ā*°, or °*lāmbu* = *alābu*, 'gourd'; *kuṃsana*, also written *kunsana* (§ 2.64) = **kussana* for Skt. *kutsana*; *samuñcita* for *samuccita*. On *-mātraṃjñātā* (Pali *mattaññutā*), *mahaṃgata* (also *mahadgata*; Pali *mahaggata*), see § 2.76.

3.4a. Short vowel plus double consonant for long vowel plus single consonant: *allīyati* = *ālīyate*; *uttaranti* = *otaranti*, § 3.54; cf. also § 2.83, where *e* was surely long before *y*, short before *yy*.

Long vowels for short

3.5. ā for a. Lengthening of historically short *a* seems to be almost wholly a matter of metrical convenience. It occurs chiefly in verses, in positions where meter requires length; rarely in prose, except for sporadic cases which are mostly explainable in special ways. It is particularly common with final *a*, including stem-final in composition. These are, as a rule, not listed in my Dictionary. There are also not a few cases of lengthening of the thematic vowel in verb forms, and other, miscellaneous, internal *a*. The following examples are nearly all from verses, and nearly all interpretable as m.c. Prose examples will be specifically identified.

3.6. *ā* for final *a*. In indeclinables: *cā* for *ca* SP 57.16; 83.4 (so with Nep. mss. and WT); 97.10; 113.1; 204.10; 294.6; LV 125.3 (divide *cā nirodha*); 220.9; 223.2; 271.9 (divide *cā kalpa-*); RP 54.22; Dbh.g. 41(67).3; *kilā* for *kila* SP 220.14 (so read with WT); *hantā* for *hanta* LV 110.17; 133.7; Dbh.g. 7(343).5; *vā* for *iva* (Dict. s.v.); *ivā* LV 175.22; *evā* for *eva* LV 216.21 (*naivā*); *ihā* for *iha* LV 324.5; RP 27.10; *nā* for *na* Gv 214.15 (divide *nā viprayogu*). Even *punā ca* occurs Gv 476.9 (vs), instead of *punaś ca*; this could be regarded as a case of the 'law of morae', like § 3.2; Pali also has *punā* for *puna* (besides *puno*).

3.7. In noun and pronoun inflection, lengthening of final *a* occurs, for the most part but not always metri causa, chiefly in forms of the *a*-declension. The final *a* of the stem is frequently lengthened in compounds, sometimes even in prose (§§ 8.15–17). In the nom. and acc. sg., the final *a*, as representative of historic *as* or *o* etc., is sometimes lengthened (§§ 8.24, 38). In the voc. sg. the lengthening is very common but does not appear to be primarily a metrical matter (§ 8.27). For instr. sg. *enā*, *inā* see §§ 8.39, 40, and for *inā* in pronouns § 21.14; for dat. sg. *āyā*, § 8.44; for gen. sg. *asyā* § 8.58. Note also the personal pronoun forms *mamā* and *tavā*, §§ 20.29, 33.

3.8. In verb inflection, lengthening of final *a* occurs in the 2 sg. imperative (§ 30.11); and in the 2 pl. ending *thā* for *tha*, imperative or optative (§§ 26.14, 15); also indicative, including e. g. future, as: *tapsyathā* RP 18.14 (vs). The gerund endings *ya* and *iya* also appear as *yā* and *iyā*, usually m.c., but sometimes apparently in metrically indifferent positions (§§ 35.10, 39, 40).

3.9. *ā* for non-final *a*. Lengthening of non-final *a* occurs, first, in the case of the thematic vowel; on this see §§ 27.1 ff. We have counted as 'final' the stem-final *a* of nouns at the end of prior members of compounds. Nearly all the rest are, or could be, cases of metrical lengthening. They are, moreover, far less common than lengthenings of final *a*. Geiger 24 cites similar cases in Pali, which he finds particularly in the first syllable of words and attributes to the influence of word-accent. This theory seems to me doubtful.

3.10. The clearest prose cases I have noted are *cāraṇa* for *caraṇa*; *pāripūri* (also Pali), *pāriśuddhi* (also Pali) for *pari*°, and (not in Pali) *pāripūraka*, *pārihāṇa*, *pārihāṇi*, *pārihāraka*, all for *pari*°; *durāvagāhatvāt* LV 424.11; so all mss.; Calc. *durava*°, see Dict.

3.11. In verses, presumably m.c.: (SP) *anābhibhūta*; *anābhibhū*; *ānubhāva* (regular in Pali in prose as well as verse); (LV) *ātireka*; *Anāvatapta*; *svālaṃkṛtaṃ* (*sv-a*°); *bhāviṣyanti* (etc., s.v. *bhāvati*); *śayāni* for *śayane*; *sāvāsanā*, for *sa-* (associative prefix); *nirāparādha* for *nir-apa*°; *sāhoḍhā* for *sa*°, i. e. *saha-ū*°; *samāya(taḥ)* probably for *samaya-taḥ*; (Mv) *pratibhāṇito* for °*bhaṇito*; *pāripūrṇa* for *pari*°; *ānuśāsti* for *anu*°; (Suv and Gv) *nir-ābhiramya* for *nir-a*°; (Samādh) *ān-abhiramyāḥ* for *an-*; *bhāvāmi* for *bha*°; (RP) *nirānuraktā* for *nir-anu*°; probably *acāra-*,

'constant, unchanging', for *acara-*; (Gv) *sāmabhilaṣatyā* for *sam°*. In verses, but metrically indifferent, *pāṭirāja* for Pali *paṭi°*, Skt. *prati°*.

3.12. ī for i. Lengthening of historic *i* to *ī* has been recorded only in verses, and almost exclusively in positions where a long syllable is required. By exception it occurs in metrically neutral positions, namely at the end of pādas or lines where quantity appears to be indifferent; for example in *bhontī* (= *bhavanti*) SP 326.10; Śikṣ 329.9; 331.1, 3 (in the same Śikṣ passage short vowels are presented at the end of lines of the same meter, e. g. in 328.1, 3, 5, 6, and *bhonti* also 331.1); or in *tvayī*, for *tvayi*, used as instr. sg. of the 2 personal pronoun, Gv 489.14 (end of a rathoddhatā line; other such lines in the same passage end in short vowels).

3.13. We shall see (§§ 10.9, 11) that the stem form of what are in Skt. short *i*-stem nouns, in composition and before such suffixes as *-mant*, often show *ī*. This is certainly not chiefly a matter of meter, since it appears in prose. But these cases seem to me to deserve no more than mention here. They appear to be part of the far-reaching morphological blend of *i*, *ī*, and *in*-stems, which appears thruout the declension. That is, the lengthening is not, or at least not primarily or exclusively, a phonological matter.

3.14. *ī* for final *i*. In indeclinables: *pratī* LV 119.7; *hī* SP 97.4; Gv 240.19; *yadī* SP 305.13; LV 242.22; *apī* LV 46.3; 109.19; 194.5; *pī* (= *api*) Sukh 51.3. Indeclinables as prior members of compounds: *vīmati*; *vītatha-*; *-atīśaya-*. Also when the vowel is 'final' only thru MIndic loss of an original final consonant: *kocī* Mv i.166.10 (so Senart with good mss. support; followed by *iha*: vv.ll. *°ci*, *°cid*, both bad metrically).

3.15. In noun and pronoun inflection, we find such (usually metrical) lengthenings as *adhvanī* for *adhvani* (§ 17.59); nom.-acc. pl. nt. forms in *-nī* for *-ni*, as *kuntalānī* LV 49.20, *trīṇī* SP 33.4; instr. pl. of *a*-stems in *-ehī*, *-ebhī* instead of *-ehi* (which is very common in BHS) and *-ebhi*; besides *tvayī* for *tvayi*, above § 3.12. There is also the curious loc. sg. *lokī* Gv 253.5, isolated so far as I know; see § 8.59. We may compare the apparent sporadic occurrence of *-ū* and (with qualifications) *-ā* (§§ 8.21, 24) in the nom. sg. of *a*-stems, instead of *-u* and *-a* which themselves replace *-o* (*-as*) chiefly in positions where meter requires a short final.

3.16. In verb inflection, any final *i* of an ending may appear as *ī*, but chiefly if not exclusively in verses m.c. See § 26.2 for examples.

3.17. *ī* for non-final *i*. All the following examples occur in verses where meter demands a long in the syllable in question. Some are hardly to be separated in principle from the cases of 'final' *ī* for *i*. Thus the instr. pl. ending appears as *-bhīr*, before a vowel: *bahubhīr acintyair* SP 385.3. Before suffixal *ka*, what are normally or at least historically *i*-stems show *ī*, just as before suffixal *mant* and in noun compounds (see § 10.12): *prāñjalīka*; *anupadhīka*; *cārīkā* for *cārikā*; *saṃskṛta-gatīkam anāgatīkam*. Cases like *sukuṇḍalīnam* Suv 246.7 (for *°linam*, 'having fair earrings') have been included under the *i-ī-in* declension.

3.18. More sporadic, and hardly of morphological significance, are the inf. *kṣayītum* Śikṣ 345.10; *a-parājīta* for *°jita*; *su-pīthita* = *°pithita*, 'well closed, guarded'; *śoṇīta*, 'blood', for *śoṇita* (see Dict.).

3.19. Even epenthetic *i* may, it seems, be lengthened m.c.: *śīriye* LV 54.8 (vs), for *śiriye* (which to be sure most mss. read, unmetrically) = Skt. *śriye*.

3.20. ū for u. Lengthening of historic *u* to *ū*, like that of *a* and *i*, is mostly a matter of metrical convenience. Of the examples which seem to belong here, only *pūṭa*, (*pari*)*sphūṭa*, and *sūrata* occur in prose. And I have noted no others in metrically indifferent positions in verse. As in the case of *i*-stems, *u*-stems in composition with lengthened *ū* (§ 12.6) are not regarded as primarily pertinent here.

3.21. *ū* for final *u*. In indeclinables: *tū* SP 97.7; *suṣṭhū* SP 213.4; *khū* (for *khu* = *khalu*) SP 308.9; *ma hū* (v.l. *°khū*; = *mā khalu*) LV 141.3; *sādhū* LV 110.13 (most mss. *sādhus*); 220.15 (most mss. *sādhu*, unmetrically); 276.2 (no v.l.); *jātū* LV 120.9 and 10.

3.22. The indeclinable *su* lengthened to *sū* in cpds.: *sūrata-*, which, however, occurs in prose and in metrically indifferent positions, as does also the equivalent *surata* (Pali seems to have only *sūrata*, *sorata* in this sense of 'mild, gentle'); *sū-sukhitaḥ* Samādh 19.28, 31; *sū-pariśuddhe* Samādh 19.35; *sūgatī-* Gv 54.25; *Sūdhana-* (n. pr., otherwise *Sudhana*) Gv 208.11; 215.14.

3.23. In noun inflection, the loc. pl. ending *su* appears m.c. as *sū*: *gṛheṣū* LV 57.1; *diśāsū* SP 53.11; *vidhiṣū* Gv 55.3; *gatīṣū* SP 9.6; 48.3; *pañcasū* RP 59.6; *ṣaṭsū* SP 9.6; 48.3; *daśasū* SP 53.11 etc. (§ 19.27). The imperfect tradition often records forms with short *u* where meter demands *ū*; so in LV 152.1 Lefmann properly reads *dikṣū*, tho all his mss. are reported as reading *dikṣu*.

3.24. Once *ū* seems to occur for nom. sg. *u* (= *o*, *as*) of *a*-stems (like *ā* for *a* in the same ending), § 8.21.

3.25. In verb inflection, final *u* is lengthened m.c. in the impv. endings *tu*, *ntu* (§ 30.13); in 3 pl. aorist endings in *-ṣu*, *-su* (§§ 32.33, 35, 38); as to *voḍhū* for inf. *voḍhuṃ* see § 3.3.

3.26. *ū* for non-final *u*. This is not common. It is probably m.c. in: *an-ūpalipta* (cf. *an-opa°*; Pali also *an-ūpalitta* m.c. for *anu°*); *śrūṇute* LV 74.9 (m.c. for *śruṇute*, § 3.96, semi-MIndic for *śṛṇute* which several mss. read unmetrically); *kūhanā* and (*a-*)*kūhaka-* = *kuh°*. But *pūṭa* (cf. *pūṭī*), which seems related to Skt. *puṭa* (and *puṭī*), occurs in prose; also *sphūṭa* and *parisphūṭa*, for (*pari*)*sphuṭa*.

Short vowels for long

3.27. a for ā. *a* for final *ā*: in indeclinables, only in verses m.c.: *tada* SP 68.1, 2; Mv i.111.16; ii.300.6; 318.21; 338.16; Suv 147.2; Gv 214.4; *tatha* SP 84.8, 13; 87.1; 90.12; 96.3, 16; 97.12; LV 49.8, 14; Mv iii.136.15; Suv 23.10; 37.16; 60.4; Samādh 19.18; *sada* SP 91.2; 93.13; 97.11; 98.5; 155.3 (so read with all Nep. mss. and WT); LV 41.20; Bhad 15; Sukh 9.8; Mv ii.376.11; 389.1; Samādh 8.26, 31; 19.28, 31, 34, 36; RP 5.16; 11.2; *yada* SP 147.14; Mv i.154.15; *yatha* SP 89.13; 96.9; 99.1; LV 41.16; Mv i.70.6; 166.14; ii.81.1, 7; 88.13; 135.16; 321.22; 334.2, 6; 340.9; Suv 60.2; 146.7; RP 6.1; 11.1; Bhad 55; *mithya* LV 38.1; *va* (= *vā*) LV 111.1; 120.13; read *va* for *vā* Mv i.155.7; *ma* (= *mā*) LV 123.5; 141.3 (*ma*, v.l. *mā*; followed by *hū*, v.l. *khū*, = *khalu*); 237.1; 288.4 (v.l. *mā*); RP 59.7.

3.28. In composition: *yatha-bhūtaṃ* (read as cpd.) LV 188.18; *samudayāntv* Divy 399.16 (m.c. for *samudā-yāntv*; note *āyāntu* in next verse, 399.19). In RP 52.9 Finot reads *akarṣaya* and understands it for *ākarṣayan*, with *a* m.c. for preverb *ā*, but the correct reading is *akarkaśa*, as in the Śikṣ 320.9 citation of this passage, supported by Tib. acc. to Bendall. On *acchindati* for *āchindati* see below.

3.29. In an indeclinable which in Skt. ends in *āt*, after MIndic loss of *t*, *a* for *ā* m.c.: *paśca* (= *paścāt*) Suv 52.1.

3.30. In noun inflection, final *ā* is shortened to *a*, chiefly but not always m.c. (sometimes in prose, at least according to the tradition), in stem final of prior members of cpds., and in various case endings, particularly those of the *ā*-declension. As in *paśca* for *paścāt*, above, these include cases in which a final consonant followed the *ā* in Skt., or even in which a nasalization followed it in normal MIndic, as in the acc. sg. *ām* (MIndic *aṃ*). For *ā*-stem forms see §§ 9.6, 8, 9, 16–19, 86, 87. The same shortening

occurs, in verses m.c., with *mahā-*, composition form of *mahat-*: *mahabuddhaghoṣaṃ* LV 116.20; *mahadakṣiṇīyaḥ* Mv ii.300.4; *maha-abhijña-upāya-jñāne* Gv 477.1, 'in the knowledge of the great *abhijñās* and *upāyas*'. In other declensions *a* occurs for *ā* final (Skt., or MIndic after loss of final consonant). So, in verses m.c., in the n. and acc. pl. of *a*-stems (§§ 8.79, 94); in the nom. sg. of *r*-stems (§§ 13.6, 15) and *n*-stems (§ 17.6); in the instr. sg. of *nt*-stems (§ 18.84) and other consonant stems (§ 15.16). On gen. sg. *-asya* for fem. *asyās* (not limited to verses m.c.; rather substitution of masc. for fem. form) see §§ 9.75, 76.

3.31. *a* for non-final *ā*. These fall into two very distinct groups. In the first, the shortening occurs only in verses and seems definitely m.c. Here belong the numerous cases of shortening of long thematic vowel in verb forms (ending *āmi* etc., § 27.9). There are also a fair number of miscellaneous cases: *abhinadita*, 'caused to sound' = *abhinādita*; *Syamu* for *Śyāmaḥ*; *prodyayamāna* = *prodyāyamāna*; *duyamanu* = *dūyamānaḥ*; *bhasi* = *(a)bhāṣi* (2 sg. aor. of *bhāṣ*, 'speak'); *-saṃsarī* = *saṃsāriṇaḥ*; *svākarāś* = *svākārāś*; acc. to Senart *mahāpakaṃ* Mv i.104.12 (= *mahāpākaṃ*; but see Dict.); *nivyāpara* = *nirvyāpāra*; *anantariya* = *ānantarīya*; *ajīvika* = *ājīvika*; *kakhorda* = *kā°*; *karaka*, 'doer, maker', in LV 340.4, Dbh.g. 27(53).11.

3.32. In the second group, on the contrary, we have MIndic shortening of *ā* to *a* before a consonant cluster. Such forms may be definitely MIndic in all respects: *khajja, khajjaka, khajjati* = *khādya* etc.; *kilanta, parikilanta*, etc., = *(pari)klānta*, § 3.109; *acchindati* as in Pali, = *āchinatti*; *ayyaka* = Pali id., Skt. *āryaka*; *payyaka* = Pali id., Skt. **prāryaka*; *jambūnada* = *jā°*.

3.33. There are also cases in which, as in MIndic, the shortening takes place before an original Skt. consonant cluster which has been broken by MIndic epenthesis: *kariya* = *kārya*; *ariya* = *ārya*; *ācariya* = *ācārya*. Cf. the like with *i* for *ī*, *u* for *ū*, §§ 3.38, 45. There is also a hyper-Sanskritic *bharikā*, Sanskritization of MIndic *bhariyā*, 'wife' = Skt. *bhāryā*.

3.34. In other cases the forms may be called semi-MIndic. So *vasyati*, 'cries, shrieks' (= Pali *vassati*) for Skt. *vāśyate*; *uparddha* for *upārdha*, half-Sanskritized from Pali *upaḍḍha*; *margati* = *mārgati*; *jatya*, perhaps for *(a)jātya*; *attāttamīya* = Pali *attattaniya*, Skt. *ātmātmīya*; *samajñā* = *samājñā*, Pali *samaññā*; *utsaryati*, pass. to *utsārayati*; *pradanti*, Chap. 43, s.v. *dā* (4).

3.35. In LV 419.8 (vs) *atma* is read in both edd., for *ātmā* (the final *a* is m.c.), without v.l. in Lefm.; Foucaux quotes one ms. as reading *ātma* (implying that the other two which he had at his disposal read *atma* with Calc.; to be sure, the footnote in Calc. quotes the text as *ātma*). Unless the form is an uncorrected misprint in both edd., which seems unlikely, it appears that we have a semi-Sanskritzed form of Pali *atta*. So *atmānaṃ* Ud xvii.10; *atmānam, atmā* xix.12. In badly printed texts like Gv, isolated cases of this sort are apt to be misprints. So *(an-)attamanas* in Gv 411.8 may be a misprint for *(an-)ātta°*, tho it coincides with the Pali form.

3.36. Instead of Skt. *tathātva*, BHS has usually *tathatva* = Pali *tathatta*, of which *tathatva* is probably a semi-Sanskritization. Note that Mvy 134 has the correct Skt. *tathātva*. The equivalent *tathātā* is only found in BHS. There is a similar *mithyatva* = Pali *micchatta* (Skt. *mithyātva*), antonym of *tathatva*. The form *tathatā* also occurs in Pali, but is noted only once in PTSD (Vism. 518.18); *tathatta* is much commoner. In BHS *tathatā* is not noticeably rarer than *tathatva*. But, being clearly a Buddhist word, its form is probably influenced by the semi-MIndic *tathatva*; or rather it was a direct inheritance from the common MIndic original of BHS and Pali, with pre-suffixal *a* due to influence of *tathatta*. To be sure, Pali has an adjective *a*-stem *tatha* (not in BHS). It can hardly be anything but a secondary back formation from *tathatta* (*tathatā*), or perhaps from *vitatha*, or partly from both sources.

3.37. i for ī. Metrical considerations, unsupported by others, play a smaller rôle here. Particularly as regards original final *i* for older *ī*, either as absolute final or in the seam of cpds., it hardly exists except in nouns of the *ī*-declension, where it is certainly not wholly, probably not primarily, a metrical matter; see §§ 10.9, 10. The Skt. *idānīm* appears, as in Pali, commonly as *dāni*, in prose (at least of Mv) as well as verse; rarely (in vss) as *idāni*. Before a vowel we find *dānim*, only in verses; and Mv several times has *dāniṃ* before consonants, in verses where a long final is required. We also find *tadāni* (Skt. °*nīm*) at least once, in prose, Mv i.253.6.

3.38. In non-final position, *ī* before a consonant cluster is sometimes shortened by the standard MIndic change. So *praticchita*, ppp., = *pratī°*, Pali *paṭicchati*; *iryā, iryati* etc. (Skt. *īr°*); *irṣyā* = *īrṣyā*; but *iranta(ḥ)* Gv 372.13 (vs) for *īrayantaḥ* seems to show purely metrical shortening; *nirikṣya* for *nirīkṣya* (one ms. *nirīkṣaṃ*); and *udikṣiṣu* for *udīkṣiṣu*, twice, 3 pl. aor. of *udikṣati* (*ud-īkṣ*); *adhiṣṭo* for *adhīṣṭo*. And *viriya* = Pali id., Skt. *vīrya* (vss, m.c.); here MIndic epenthesis has broken the originally following consonant cluster (cf. the same with *a* for *ā*, *u* for *ū*, (§§ 3.33, 45).

3.39. Before single consonants, the following seem most likely to be cases of metrical shortening pure and simple: *jāniyāt*, 3 sg. opt. of *jñā*, SP 31.5; *a-pāniyā*, 'waterless'; *suśila* = *suśīla*; *bibhatsa, bibhatsana*, = *bī°*; *apiḍita* = *apīḍita*; *salila* = *sa-līla*; *uṣṇiṣa* = *uṣṇīṣa*; *kṣitiśa* = *kṣitīśa*; *gabhira* = *gabhīra, gambhīra*.

3.40. In other cases, even tho many of the occurrences of *i* are favored by meter, there is reason to suspect that other considerations are concerned. The form *kriṇati* for *krīṇati* is not rare, is found also in Pali, and is certainly not at bottom a metrical matter; see § 28.5. The adjective *alika* = Skt. *alīka*, 'false', also occurs in Pali; acc. to Geiger 23 the shortening is due to MIndic accent on the first syllable; to me it seems more likely a matter of adaptation to suffixal forms in *-ika*.

3.41. The Pali *dutiya, tatiya*, and their Pkt. equivalents, to which BHS *dvitiya, tṛtiya* correspond, are also explained by Geiger 23 as due to accent conditions. Pischel 82 and Jacobi Kalpas. 103 explain them as derived from prehistoric **dvitya*, **tritya* (cf. AMg. *docca, ducca*). To me it seems much more likely that we have here analogical modification of Skt. *dvitīya, tṛtīya*, adapted to the numerous forms in suffixal *iya*, compared with which forms in *īya* were sporadic and seemed anomalous. In BHS, however, the forms are rare and seem to occur only as required by meter, hence in a sense (selectively) m.c.

3.42. The influence of forms in suffixal *iya* seems also likely to be present in some forms ending in *-aniya* for Skt. *-anīya*, gerundives and others (cf. § 22.20). In every case meter requires a short *i*: *darśaniya, śāsaniya, -premaṇiya*.

3.43. Analogical influence of a different sort is shown in forms of the root *nī* showing *i* for Skt. *ī* (ppp. *-nita-* and ger. *-niya*). Tho such forms occur only in verses and could be called 'm.c.', they are frequent, even in prose, in Pkt. Pischel 81 explains them as due to accentual conditions, which I do not believe. They are simply analogical to the MIndic present *-neti*, on patterns like *katheti*: *kathita-*: *kathiya*. Our language shows this shortening only in compounds of *nī* (so also prevailingly in Pkt., Pischel l.c.). See §§ 34.7; 38.3; Dict. s.v. *samudānana*.

3.44. u for ū. Aside from the morphological confusion of noun stems in *u* and *ū* (§ 12.7 ff.), I have no cases of shortening of final *ū*.

3.45. Occasionally MIndic forms containing medial *u* for *ū* which is, or in Skt. was, followed by a consonant cluster, are found in BHS: *omuddhaka* = *avamūrdha(ka)*;

sukhuma, sukhama = *sūkṣma*; *suriya* = *sūrya*; *turiya* = *tūrya*. Cf. the like with *a* for *ā*, *i* for *ī*, §§ 3.33, 38.

3.46. Otherwise I have noted only shortening of internal *ū*, m.c., with the possible exception of *pureya* = *pūr°*, see Dict. s.v. *pura(ya)ti*. It is specially frequent in *bhuta* for *bhūta* and cpds., as in Ap., where *huya* is common e. g. in the verses of San. (see Jacobi's Glossary): *bhuta, udbhuta, saṃbhuta, tūṣṇībhuta*. Others: *bhuyo, bhuyu* = *bhūyas*; *duyamanu* = *dūyamānaḥ*; *rupa* = *rūpa*; *puja* = *pūjā*; *śruyāt* (precative of *śru*), Chap. 43, s.v. *śru* (8); *Virudhaka, Virupākṣa* = *Virūdhaka, Virūpākṣa*.

Substitution of *i, ī* for *e, ai*

3.47. We find *i* for *e* chiefly as metrical shortening, and for the most part in certain morphological categories, where examples will be found: in the loc. sg. of *a*-stem nouns (§§ 8.59, 60); in the instr. sg. of *a*-stem nouns and pronouns (*inā* for *ena*, §§ 8.40; 21.14); in *mi, ti, si* for *me, te, se* of pronouns (§§ 20.29, 33; 21.19); in the n. and acc. pl. of generic pronouns (§§ 21.25, 32); in personal verb endings (§ 26.3; in part these may be regarded as replacement of medio-passive by active endings). Cases of saṃdhi in which final *a* is elided before initial *i*, leaving *i* for Skt. *e*, could also be regarded as pertinent here; see § 4.23.

3.48. Other cases are few and scattering. In vss m.c. we find *saci* for *sacet* (besides *saca*); *Maitriyo* for *Maitreyo*; *praṇitar* for *praṇetar*; *praṇidhisi* for *praṇidhesi* (2 sg. pres.). In LV 74.22 (vs) *sthāpite sma māya mūrdhni pāṇi*, 'Māyā would put her hand on the head' (of those sick ones; cf. the prose account 72.4), it seems that *sthāpite* must represent *sthāpete* (or *°ti*, Skt. *sthāpayati*). It is not likely to be loc. of the ppp., which would involve taking *pāṇi* as loc. (note the v.l. *pāṇiṃ*, which is unmetrical but suggests my interpretation). In LV 54.15, however, read with v.l. *upasthapitvanā* (ger.) for text *upasthapisva nā*.

3.49. Of different character are a few sporadic cases of *i* for *e* before a consonant cluster. Here we seem to have Prakritic *i* for *e* (which may = Skt. *aya*), which, in MIndic, is automatically shortened (and in Pkt. often written *i*, Pischel 84) before two consonants: *praṇidhintāna* Mv i.124.18 (vs; so 5 mss., Senart with 1 inferior ms. *°dhentāna*; gen. pl. pres. pple. of *praṇidheti*); *yācintyā(ḥ*, before *a-*) Mv i.133.1 (prose; kept by Senart; for Skt. *yācayantyāḥ*, or rather *yācantyāḥ*, since *yācayati* is only causative in Skt.).

3.50. Once *vīra*, 'enmity', is recorded for Skt. *vaira*, Pali *vera*. On *ī* for Skt. *ai* cf. AMg. *dhīraya* = *dhairya* (Ratnach.), and Ap. *dhīra* = id., Jacobi, San. 513.1.

u, ū for *o* (and *au*)

3.51. For the most part, this too is a matter of metrical shortening. It occurs in *ahu* for the interjection *aho* SP 62.4. Otherwise the *o* replaced by *u* is oftenest a (generalized) saṃdhi representative of Skt. *as*; but sometimes also a MIndic form of Skt. *ava*.

3.52. For *as* = *o*, we find *u* (once apparently *ū* by secondary lengthening, § 8.21) in various noun and pronoun endings: nom. sg. m. of *a*-stems (and, by transfer, of what in Skt. are consonantal stems; also in nom. pl. m. and nom. sg. fem., by transfer from nom. sg. m.); in the abl. sg. forms in *-tu* (*ātu, atu, ītu, itu*); in *īyu* for *īyo*, gen. sg. fem. of *ī(i)* stems, and *u* for *o* (*as*) in the gen. sg. of consonantal (*nt*) stems; in the nom.-acc. sg. of *s*-stems; and once in *nu* for *no* = *nas*, 1st pers. pl. pronoun, enclitic. For cases of saṃdhi between final *a, ā*, and initial *u*, yielding *u* where Skt. would have *o*, see § 4.24.

3.53. Further, in miscellaneous adverbs (all in vss): *bhūyu* = *bhūyas* SP 95.1; LV 190.20; 231.8; RP 11.8; *bhuyu*, id., § 3.46; *śreyu* = *śreyas* LV 57.3; *sarvaśu* = *sarvaśaḥ* Samādh 19.29; for *sarvaśaḥ* SP 255.13, La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1073 reads *sarvaśuḥ*, at the end of a line, metrically indifferent; *tatu* = *tatas* LV 164.22; 169.22; *puratu* = *puratas* LV 81.11; *sarvatu* = *sarvatas* Gv 43.6.

3.54. As in the case of *i* for *e* (§ 3.49), *u* also occurs for MIndic *o* = Skt. *ava* before a Skt. consonant cluster. This, as in Pkt., is a representation of, or substitute for, short *o* in a closed syllable: *ukrami* = *okrami, avakrami*; *manujña* = Pali *manuñña*, for *manojña*; *uttaranti* = **ottaranti* or *otaranti* (so one ms.), for *avataranti*, 'arrive at, betake themselves to'; in this last we have doubling of consonant besides shortening of vowel, by the 'law of morae' (§ 3.4a and Geiger 6.2); *ucchādya* for *avachādya*; *ullokanaka* for *olok°*.

3.55. In Dbh.g. 6(342).21 *aśaṭh'ūjñakāś* (*ca*), 'free from deceitfulness and contempt', see Dict. s.v. *ujña-ka*, implies an **ujñā*, or rather perhaps something like **ūñā* or **ūṇā* (cf. *āṇā*, Dict.; since the *ū*, even as the result of *a* plus *u* in saṃdhi, could be long originally only before a single consonant), = Pali *uññā* = Skt. *avajñā* (with suffixal *ka* in Bahuvrīhi cpd.). Further, in *ukirati* = *ok°* for *avak°*, *o* for Skt. *ava* before a single consonant is shortened to *u* m.c. And sporadically *ū* occurs, as in Pali, for *o* of other origins; so *-rūpayati* for *-rop°*, Chap. 43, s.v. *ruh* (5).

3.56. A few times we seem to find *u* for Skt. *au*, which presumably was first reduced to MIndic *o*. Thus twice in dual forms, *antu* and *imu* for *antau* and *imau*, § 8.75 (but v.l. in both *a* for *u*); and once in *stuti*, m.c., em., for *stauti* of ms., but see Dict. for other possible explanations. These cases are uncertain; if sound, they seem due to metrical requirements. Different is *duvārika* = Pkt. *duvāriya*, which Hem. 1.160 derives from Skt. *dauvārika*. However, Skt. also has (*rāja-*)*dvārika* once at least; perhaps we should derive the Pkt. and BHS forms from this, with epenthetic *u*, cf. *duvāra*.

u for *a*

3.57. As in Pali (Geiger 18.1) and Pkt. (Pischel 104), *a* is sometimes changed to *u* after (and perhaps before) labial consonants; see Chap. 43, s.v. *-vuṭṭati* (=*vartati*) and (under root *vṛ*, cover) *-vurati* (Pali *-purati*), for *-varati*; *sruvate* = *sravate*, § 28.37.

u for *am* (*ām*)

3.58. This phonetic change, on the dialectic relations of which see § 1.97, seems limited to verses, m.c. It is abundantly illustrated in the acc. sg. and nom.-acc. sg. nt. of *a*-stems (§ 8.30; also by transfer in the acc. sg. of *ā*-stems and of thematized consonantal stems). It also occurs in the gen. pl. *ānu* for *ānāṃ* thru MIndic *ānaṃ* (§ 8.125), and in that of pronouns (*teṣu* for *teṣāṃ*, etc., § 21.40). Further *ahu* or *hu* is used for *aham*, *vayu* for *vayam*, *ayu* for *ayam* (§§ 20.7, 38; 21.79). It is rare in Mv; examples there are *aśavalu* (mss.) ii.299.14 and *pareṣu* (= *pareṣām*) i.286.9.

e for *i, ī*

3.59. In some MIndic forms *e* occurs for *i* and *ī* of Skt., as Pali *edisa* = *īdṛśa*; and possibly Pali *ettaka*, perhaps cf. Skt. *iyattaka*; Pkt. *ketti(y)a*, perhaps cf. Skt. *kiyat* (Pali *kittaka*); and *eyāṇiṃ*. These appear in BHS as *edṛśa* (also *kedṛśa*), *ettaka, kettaka, edāniṃ*; (more doubtfully) *eha*. The frequent MIndic writing of (short) *e* for *i* before a consonant cluster may account for *veṣṭi* (AMg. *veṭṭhi*) = Skt. *viṣṭi*; and cf. *Lecchavi*, below, § 3.67.

3.60. In other cases *e* seems more or less clearly to occur as metrical lengthening for *i*. A very clear case is *lokadhātv eyaṃ* (for *iyaṃ*) SP 306.7 (vs; so both edd., all mss.). Similarly *lokadhātv emāṃ* (for *imāṃ*) SP 355.4.

On the other hand, in LV 210.4 (vs) text *mā vilambahe*, 'do not delay!', while it might perhaps be taken for *vilambahi* = *vilamba*, has been taken in § 30.8 as *vilamba he* (interjection). On *daśadiśe* LV 291.2 (vs), loc. of either *diśā* or *diś* (in the latter case m.c. for *diśi*), see § 9.78. Doubtful is *teṣa* or *teṣu* (for *teṣā*), perhaps to AMg. *tisā* = Skt. *tṛṣā*, 'thirst', with *e* for MIndic *i*, m.c.

3.61. In verb endings, *te* and *se* instead of *ti* and *si* may be interpreted as middle for active endings, §§ 37.24, 25. There is however little doubt that generally they are used for the sake of meter. So *paśyate* Mv ii.359.17, 19; 360.11, 13, etc., where *paśyati* would be metrically bad; other cases are e. g. *bhavate*, *jahate* Mv ii.382.16 and 17; *pravadase* iii.346.2; and many other cases l. c.

e for *aya*, *ayi*, and *avi*

3.62. This common MIndic change is very frequent in BHS. Numerous illustrations can be found in our treatment of causatives and denominatives. In other verb forms it is also common; e. g. *praṇeti* (read °*tī* with Nep. mss. and WT, m.c.) = *praṇayati* SP 62.12; *neti* Mv ii.81.9. Also in nouns: *lena* = *layana*; *janetrī*, 'mother' = *janayitrī*, Pali *janettī*. For *avi*, *e* occurs in *bheṣyati* = *bhaviṣyati*, the regular BHS future of *bhū*; and in *thera* = Pali id., Skt. *sthavira*, 'old'; half-Sanskritized as *sthera*, 'an elder' (religious).

3.63. Hypersanskritic *aya* for MIndic *e* may occur in such forms as *-dhayati* for *-dheti*, etc., § 28.48.

Metrically short *e*

3.64. Instead of *i*, the usual metrical shortening for *e*, the texts sometimes write *e*, especially in word-final (cf. Pischel 85), in positions where meter requires a short: *tĕ anyam-anyaṃ* SP 85.12, 13; *tĕ nityakālam* SP 131.4; *tĕ buddhaśāsanam* SP 152.11; *kariṣyĕ 'ham* LV 223.5 (Lefm. em. *kariṣya haṃ*); *gacchamānakĕ* LV 235.8; *yĕ hi* LV 324.15 (Lefm. em. *yahi*); *tuṣitālayĕ* LV 364.7 (Lefm. em. °*ya*); *tĕ imu* LV 393.6 (v.l. *ta imu*); in LV 400.18 read probably *brahmann itī satata yĕ śrotavantaḥ*; *dahyamānĕ* Mv i.69.1; *uktĕ* 69.13; *pārśvĕ* 71.5; *tĕ* 80.16; *sarvajñatāyĕ* 82.13; *puruṣasiṃhatāyĕ ā-* 83.6; *mĕ* (before consonant) ii.8.17; *deśĕ-deśe* Suv 58.4; *śīlĕ*, *dhyānĕ* Samādh 19.35; optatives, § 29.13.

3.65. In medial position, rare: *phĕna-* LV 176.2, cited Śikṣ 237.11 (Lefm. em. *phana-*, see Dict.); *tasya viśĕṣu* LV 365.14; *bhavĕma* LV 422.6.

e for *o* (final)

3.66. This so-called 'Magadhism' (see § 1.32 with fn. 11), found also in AMg. and occasionally in Pali, occurs in the adverb *pure* (= Pali, AMg. id., Skt. *puras*), chiefly in vss. The nom. (voc.) sg. m. (and nt.) of *a*-stems in *e*, nouns and pronouns, may also be classed here, §§ 8.25, 28, 37; 21.7. It is questionable whether the isolated *puni*, LV 151.8 (vs), for *punar*, represents an otherwise unrecorded **pune*. But *ante* (as in Pali, AMg.; also in cpds.) occurs for Skt. *antar*.

e for *ai*

3.67. We also find *e* for *ai* as in MIndic, for instance in *eti* = *aiti*; *metra* = *maitrā*; *sarveṣaṇa-* = *sarvaiṣaṇa-* (*sarva-eṣaṇa-*) LV 34.14 (prose; all mss.); *cetiya* = Pali id., Skt. *caitya*; *eṇeya* = *aiṇ*°; *lecchavi* = **laicchavi* (adj. to *licchavi*; even when used of a single person probably a vṛddhi formation, yet possibly a case of *e* for *i* as suggested by Senart, note on Mv i.255.9, see § 3.59); *erāvaṇa* = *airā*° (prose); *dvemāsika*, *tremāsika*; *ve* = *vai*.

e (*o*) = MIndic *e* (*o*) of secondary (analogical) origin

3.68. In *gredha*, also *parigredha*, 'greed', we see a hyper-Sktization of Pali *gedha*, *paligedha*, which are analogically based on Pali *giddha* etc. = Skt. *gṛddha* etc., on patterns like Skt. *niṣiddha*: *niṣedha*; Pali *viddha*: *vedha*, etc. Similarly *paligodha* (Aśokan ib.), to *paliguddha*, § 3.92; *moṣa*(*-dharma*) = Pali *mosa*, to Pali *musā* = *mṛṣā*.

ai by Hypersanskritism for *e*

3.69. Possibly in *vaiṇu* for *veṇu* (if not a mere corruption; cannot be vṛddhi-formation).

ai, vṛddhi to MIndic (epenthetic) *i*

3.70. As in Pali *gelañña*, vṛddhi formation to *gilāna* = Skt. *glāna*, BHS shows *gailānya*, sometimes juxtaposed with the 'correct' *glānya* (which is actually not recorded in normal Skt.).

o for *ū*, chiefly as lengthening of *u*

3.71. In a number of cases *u* is lengthened to *o*, where Pali generally has *ū* (m.c.) instead. In BHS these cases seem generally determined by meter, but not always (cf. Pischel 77; Geiger 24, but with wrong explanation). Rather common is *anopalipta*, 'unstained', for *an-upalipta* = Pali *anupalitta* and (in verses, CPD; presumably m.c.) *anūpa*° (also found in BHS); it occurs not only m.c. but in prose and in metrically indifferent positions. Similarly, in verses m.c., *anopapanna* = *anupa*°; *anopalambha* = *an-upa*°; *niropadhi* = *nirupadhi* (Pali also, in vss, *nirū*°); *duropagama* = *dur-upa*°. The verb form *opalipyase* (vs, m.c.) stands for *upa*° (influenced by *anopalipta*, above?); and *vopasamati* (vs, m.c.) = Pali *vūpa*°, Skt. *vyupa*°. Twice the 3 sg. impv. ending *u* is changed to *o* m.c.: § 30.14. In Gv 212.16 (vs) *ovācu* = *uvāca*; the *o* is certainly m.c. for *u*. Once the adverb *sādhu*, 'please', appears as *sādho* m.c.: LV 41.14. (It would be far-fetched and implausible to understand a voc. *sādho*, 'good sir!'.) Mv iii.370.1 (vs) has *so*, m.c. for Pali *su* = *svid*; the same verse in Pali has *sū*. The bird-name *koṇāla* may be m.c. for *kuṇāla*. In Mmk *samodita*, 'originated', or perhaps, 'united, collected', occurs repeatedly for *samudita*, and likewise *samodaya*, probably 'origin', for *samudaya*. Both seem to occur only at the end of anuṣṭubh lines, so that *o* may be considered m.c. for *u*. But *samodita* occurs in Pali prose, which seems to indicate that something more than mere metrical convenience is involved.

3.72. Finally, as cases of *o* for older *ū*, we may note *anopa* for *anūpa*, 'marsh'; *sāropya*, 'suitable', for the usual *sārūpya*; *yosa* for Skt. *yūṣa* (Pali *yūsa*, Pkt. *jūsa*).

o for *u* before consonant cluster

3.73. At least once we find *o* for *u* written before *tt* (cf. Geiger 10.2, Pischel 125), *ottānaka* (cf. Pkt. *ottāṇa*) = *uttānaka*; the adverbs *ottareṇa*, and *pratyot*°, 'after', are probably also to be recognized; perhaps we should count here *oḍḍeti*, which = Pali both *uḍḍ*° and *oḍḍ*°. Possibly the form written *ottānaka*, above, was intended as *otānaka*, by the 'law of morae', with substitution of long vowel plus single consonant for short vowel plus double consonant (§ 3.2). In one other case this is what we find written: *otarīyati*, pass. of *ut-tar-* 'conquer', representing a more nearly 'regular' *uttarīyati*; but the form is not certain.

Metrically short *o*

3.74. As in the case of *e* (§ 3.64), final *o* is sometimes written in positions where meter requires a short; e. g. *koṭiyŏ* Mv i.61.10, 13 (in 13 preceded by *trayŏ*; see Senart's note, p. 422); *durbalŏ alpasthāmo* LV 188.6 (so mss., ed.

em. *durbala*; before this word *puruṣŏ* is also read by most mss., ed. *puruṣa* with a minority). Others, § 8.19.

o for *ava*

3.75. This regular MIndic change is very common here. Forms of the root *bhū* are frequent; rarely *hoti*, the regular MIndic form, for which BHS usually has *bhoti* etc.; these occur on almost every page in verses. For examples see Chap. 43, s.v. *bhū* (2). It should be noted that sometimes *ava* is written where meter proves that *o* must have been pronounced. So Ud xvi.16 *bhavati* (no v.l.); the line can be read metrically only with *bhoti*.

3.76. Very commonly *o* represents the preverb *ava*. Some of the following are omitted in the Dict. when the form with *ava-* is Skt. So in prose, chiefly of Mv: *oruddha* (= *avaruddha*) i.22.11; *ovādena ovadanti* 104.9; *Anotapta-gātra* (= *anavat°*) 141.10, 15; *onamati* 158.15; *osṛṣṭā . . . obhāsitaṃ* i.205.10–11 = ii.9.6 (in the latter *avabhāsitaṃ*); *obhāsentaṃ* i.213.13, 15 = ii.16.17, 20 (in 20 printed as vs); *obhāso* i.227.6; *osakta-* 231.12, etc.; also in Mvy 5524 *ovidhyana-khā* = *avavi°*; and in Bhīk 28b.5; 29a.1, 4 (prose) *osāraṇā* = Pali id. (Mvy 9306 *avasāraṇam*). In verses everywhere: *opatantaṃ* SP 83.2; *otaritvā* 114.5; *onahatī* 126.2; *anolīno* 278.9 (*an-aval°*); *abhyokiri* 325.4; *obhāṣito* LV 29.2; *okrānta* 47.9; *olambate* 134.18; *oruhyā* 271.12, 14; *orodhe* Mv i.143.7; 200.3 = ii.3.21; *otari* Bhad 29, 30; *okramatāṃ* Gv 1.16 (here, in an *āryā*, *ava-* would be metrically as good); *ovṛṣṭā* Ud iii.9 (so oldest ms.; later var. *avavṛṣṭā*, unmetrically); etc.

3.77. Other, miscellaneous forms (in vss): *loṇa* = *lavaṇa*; *proṇa* = *pravaṇa*; (prose) *upoṣati*.

o for *au*

3.78. This regular MIndic change occurs often in our texts, and is not limited to verses. A few examples: *orasa* = *aur°*; *opalambhika* = *aupa°*; *aśroṣīt* LV 143.13; 300.11–12 (both prose), and similar forms passim; *oṣadha* = *au°*; *kroñca* = *krauñca*; *kopīna* = *kau°*; *odumbara* = *aud°*.

o for final *a*, m.c.

3.79. Frequently, in verses we find *o* for word-final *a* metri causa. This has been supposed to represent the particle *u* added to the form in *a*; so Kern, Introduction to SP transl. (SBE 21) xvii; La Vallée-Poussin, MadhK 166 note 4; Hultzsch, Inscr. of Asoka lxxiii. The same scholars connect our *co* (= *ca*) with Asokan *cu*, which appears to be adversative, 'but'; it is replaced in the Girnar Aśokan inscriptions by *tu*, and was explained by Michelson (IF 23.261) as a blend of *ca* and *tu*. Whatever its origin and meaning, I do not believe it has anything to do with our *co*, for reasons set forth JAOS 66.203. It appears only as *cu* (there is one doubtful and conjectural reading *cū*), whereas our texts never have *cu*, only *co*. As to meaning, while our *co*, like Skt. *ca*, could sometimes be translated 'but', there are many cases where this would be impossible. The Aśokan inscriptions contain no other form in *u* (or *o*) for final *a*, while many such forms in *o* exist in BHS; in most of them a particle *u* could make no sense. Finally, the assumption that the particle *u* is concerned is in itself highly implausible. Even in the Veda, *u* is almost never attached to *ca* (only once in RV acc. to Grassmann, 6.66.3; never in AV acc. to Whitney); but *co* for *ca* is extremely common in our vss. In Classical Skt. *u* occurs, it seems, only after *na*, *atha*, and *kim* (BR, s.v.; Renou, Gr. p. 520), while in BHS virtually any final *a* may be replaced by *o*, but only in verses m.c.

3.80. The true explanation of this *o* for final *a* is to be sought in the frequent variation between final *a* and *o* (for Skt. *aḥ* etc.), see § 4.32, in adverbs and particles as well as noun forms and even verb forms (*ma*: *mas*, *mo* in 1 pl.). Since this variation was constantly utilized for metrical convenience in BHS verses, it led to the metrical use of *o* for any final *a* as an analogical back-formation.

3.81. The frequency of *o* for *a* varies strikingly in different texts, tho it is found at least occasionally in all older texts which contain many verses. In SP it is extremely common, tho there are often ms. variants with unmetrical *a*, and frequently KN follow the latter (their notes prove that they did not understand the meter of SP; I shall not trouble to note these errors in the following list). It is also common in Gv, but less common in LV, and rare in Mv.

3.82. It is specially frequent in adverbs and particles: *co* SP 13.15; 14.12; 63.11; 95.12; 96.15; 112.2; 119.9; 129.3; 130.9; 131.1, 10; 190.7; 204.12; 208.2; 323.12; 358.5; 364.12; 369.5; LV 43.3; in Suv. mss. and Nobel frequently (e. g. 22.7; 24.1) read unmetrically *ca* where Śikṣ, quoting from Suv, has the metrically correct *co*; Gv 213.17; 254.18; 255.5 etc.; Śikṣ 260.10. Also *adyo* = *adya* SP 118.13; 169.14; LV 92.8; 283.2 (Lefm. em. *adyā*); *ivo* = *iva* (?) LV 333.16 (but see Dict. s.v. *oruṇḍa*); *iho* Śikṣ 4.15; Gv 384.8; *hanto* = *hanta* Dbh.g. 7(343).14 (cf. *hantā* line 5 above); 21(357).16.

3.83. Numerals: *pañco* SP 14.11; Śikṣ 243.13 (so read with 2 mss. reported p. 412, note; for *pañca*, sc. *abhijñāḥ*; wrongly interpreted by Bendall whose ms. has *pañcyo*, phonetic corruption); *sapto* Gv 255.23; *daśo* SP 67.14; 98.10 (mss. and WT); 165.2; 198.7; Dbh.g. 40(66).24.

3.84. In noun declension, *o* occurs rarely for *a* as stem in composition, and as ending of voc. sg.; these may be morphological rather than phonetic (nom. sg. form used by transfer, §§ 8.12, 28).

3.85. Instr. sg. *eno* for *ena*: *teno*, one ms. for *tenā* SP 27.11 (certainly not *tenākuśalena* as suggested by Burnouf's note, cf. 22.6); 93.3 (so one ms. and WT); 119.1; 195.4; 325.12; *yeno* SP 92.2; Gv 231.16; *keno* SP 175.5.

3.86. Gen. sg. *asyo* for *asya*: *niveśanasyo* SP 114.2 (mss.); *tasyo* SP 118.12; 150.4; 175.8; 192.5; 194.4, 7; 213.5; 295.2; Śikṣ 112.3; Mv ii.377.9 = 378.3 (with mss.); 393.21 (so with v.l.); *jinasyo* SP 194.7 (with v.l. and WT); Gv 255.22; *yasyo* SP 165.2.

3.87. Personal pronoun: *mamo* = *mama* SP 326.4 (with v.l.; or *mamā*, WT); Gv 231.15.

3.88. Verb forms: *gaccho hi* Gv 208.11, for *gaccha hi*; *anuśikṣatho* Gv 481.22 (2 pl. impv., for usual *°thā* = *°tha*).

i for *a*

3.89. In suffixal forms, for Skt. (*t*)*ama*, we find (*t*)*ima* as in MIndic; see §§ 22.13–16; on *i* for thematic *a* in verbs, § 27.10.

Middle Indic representatives of *ṛ*, and Hypersanskritic *ṛ* for other vowels

3.90. a for ṛ. On *addaśi* and similar aorist forms of *dṛś* see §§ 32.25, 111. On *a* as stem-final for *ṛ* in *ṛ*-stem nouns see §§ 13.3 ff. Other cases are sporadic: *a-hasita-keśa* (so mss., to be kept; Senart em. *sahita°*), 'with hair not standing on end', cf. Pali *hasita* = Skt. *hṛṣita*, 'bristling' (of hair); *vaiyāpatya* = *°pṛtya*, *°vṛtya*; *tālavaṇṭaka* 'fan' = Pali *°vaṇṭa*, Skt. *°vṛnta*; *amata* = Pali id., Skt. *amṛta*; *saṃvimaṭṭha* Dbh.g. 22(358).19 = **saṃvimṛṣṭa* (which ed. reads by em.), cf. Pali *vimaṭṭha*; also *vimaṣṭa-ka* = Skt. *vimṛṣṭa(-ka)*; *kata-puṇya* (?) = *kṛta°*, Pali *katapuñña*; *sajati*, and *utsajati* = (*ut*)*sṛj°*; *kasina* (Pali *kasiṇa*) = *kṛtsna*; *tasiṇā* (Pali id.) = *tṛṣṇā*; *prākaṭa* = *prākṛta*; *Vaji* = *Vṛji*; *gaha* Bbh 231.11, 26; 232.7 (prose), possibly for *gṛha* (Pali *gaha*), but this is questionable; the context, placing it between *stūpa* and *kūṭa* (or *kūṭāgāra* 231.26),

indicates that it denotes a part of a shrine, specifically a part below the *kūṭa* or top; the Chinese character given for it in Wogihara's glossary means 'pagoda, shrine'; also (perhaps originally?) 'box, container'; does this point to *graha* (root *grah*)? note that *graha* is sporadically recorded for *gṛha* even in Skt. (hyper-Sanskritism for MIndic *gaha*?); *gahastha* = Pali *gahaṭṭha*, Skt. *gṛhastha*; *vaṭṭa* = Pali id., Skt. *vṛtta* (also *ati-vatta*? Dict.); *vaḍḍa*, a MIndic form of Skt. *vṛddha*; perhaps *acchaṭā* (Dict.).

3.91. i for ṛ. On *-i* for stem-final *ṛ* in *ṛ*-stem nouns see § 13.20. Otherwise only sporadic, and not always certain textually: *asādiśā*, see Dict. s.v. *sādṛśa*; perhaps *atittiga* for *atṛptigāś* (cf. Pali *atitti*); perhaps *upadiśyati* = °*dṛś*° (§ 31.1, s.v. *pad*); perhaps *uttiṇī*(*karetsu*) for *uttṛṇī*°; *iddhi* (? perhaps *riddhi*) for *ṛddhi*; *masina* (read °*ṇa*?) = AMg. *masiṇa*, Skt. *masṛṇa*; *Iṣidatta* for *Ṛṣi*°; for Skt. *kṛccha*, our dialect seems to be isolated in showing *kisara* (Dict.); cf. Pali *kasira* and *kiccha*; *ohita* = *apahṛta*; *tāyin*; *nipaka* (1).

3.92. u for ṛ. On *-u* for stem-final *-ṛ* in *ṛ*-stem nouns see §§ 13.21 ff. Otherwise sporadic and usually (as in MIndic) after a labial, or when *u* occurs in an adjoining syllable: *pucchati* (Pali, Pkt. id.) = *pṛ*°; *vukka* = *vṛkka* (not recorded in MIndic; Pali *vakka*); *vuddhi* = Pali, Pkt. id. or *vuḍḍhi*, Skt. *vṛddhi*; *paliguddha*; *janetukā* = **janayitṛkā* (not recorded in MIndic); *ujju* (= Pali *ujju* and *uju*, also *uj(j)uka*), Skt. *ṛju*; *utu* (Pali id.) = Skt. *ṛtu*, implied in *sarvotuka*; *anuśaṃsa* (q.v., Dict.), etc., if derived from *ānṛ*°.

3.93. For *ābṛḍha*, q.v. in Dict., Divy 84.10 text *ārūḍha*, intending doubtless *ābūḍha* (= Pali *abbūḷha*); the *ṛ* is originally long, Wackernagel I § 28.

3.94. ri for ṛ. Always after preceding final vowel, but mostly in prose: *riddhi* = *ṛddhi*; *ridhyate* = *ṛdh*°; *riṣi* = *ṛṣi*; *Riṣidatta*; *ritu* = *ṛtu*; *rikṣa* = *ṛkṣa*.

3.95. Hypersanskritic forms concerning ṛ. Hypersanskrit *ṛ* for *a*: *anuddhṛta* = Pali (and Skt.) *anuddhata*; perhaps *upahṛta* for *upahata*.

Hypersanskrit *ṛ* for *i*: *mṛta-* (for other texts *mita-*) *vārṣika* MSV iii.124.3, 5; Tib. thuṅ ṅu, 'short', = *mita*; *kṛttas*, cf. Pali *kittaka*?

Hypersanskrit *ṛ* for *u*: perhaps in *saṃpravṛtta*, intending °*vutta* (to *vac*) at least as to sense; *itivṛtta(ka)*; *saṃvṛti* (§ 2.30).

Hypersanskrit *ṛ* for *ri*: *ucchṛta* and *utsṛta* = *ucchrita*; *kartṛma*; *tṛdhā* or (v.l.) *tṛvidhaṃ*, also *tṛbhava*, for *tri-*; *ṛkta* = *rikta*; *mṛyati*, °*te*, *mṛyyati*, °*te*, = *mriyate*; *tādṛnaḥ* (read °*ṇaḥ*?), gen. sg., = Pali *tādino*, which to be sure historically represents *tādṛś-*, so that the *ṛ* is historic. On *dhātṛbhiḥ* for *dhātrībhiḥ* see Dict. s.v. *dhātṛ*; phonetic hyper-Sktism is doubtless involved, but surely also riming assimilation to *mātṛbhiḥ*.

3.96. A possible hyper-Sanskritism is *pratikruṣṭa*, 'bad, inferior, low'. It seems to be falsely Sktized from Pali *paṭikuṭṭha* = *paṭikiṭṭha*, both historically perhaps from BHS and Skt. Lex. *pratikṛṣṭa*. But see both words, and *pratikrośa*, °*śati*, in Dict.

Should such forms as *śruṇuya*, *śruṇo*, *śruṇati* etc., and even (§ 3.26) *śrūṇute*, be classed here, as Sktizations of MIndic *suṇo-*, *suṇu-*, *suṇa-*? Cf. Chap. 43, s.v. *śru* (1 and 3). Altho Skt. *śṛṇo-*, *śṛṇu-* doubtless derive from **śruṇo-*, **śruṇu-* by dissimilation, I do not believe BHS has a direct inheritance of those prehistoric forms.

Vowel assimilation

3.97. I have noted little that calls for comment here, after § 3.57. Our language shows a few of the forms noted for Pali by Geiger 16, 17, such as *ucchu* = Skt. *ikṣu*. Contrary to Pischel 101, I regard *seyyā* (Pali id., Pkt. *sejjā*) as showing change of Skt. *a* (*śayyā*) to *e* owing to the following *yy*. It is not at all likely that *i* in Skt. *śiśumāra* (popular etymology?) is really older than *u* in BHS *śuśu*°, AMg. *susu*°, Pali *suṃsu*°. Geiger treats Pali *timissā* (BHS *timisrā* etc.) as having *i* by assimilation from Skt. *tamisrā*, but Skt. has *i* in the obscurely related *timira*; are the Pali and BHS forms blended with this? Some other alleged cases are hardly certain enough to be worth recording here; e. g. Geiger assumes that Pali *matthaluṅga* (BHS *masta-*, *mastaka-luṅga*) = Skt. *mastuluṅga* has *a* in the antepenult by assimilation to *a* of the first syllable, but it seems quite as likely that if assimilation was concerned in any of these forms, it produced Skt. *u* (instead of *a*) in the antepenult by influence of the *u* of the penult. On *i* and *u* for Skt. *ṛ*, sometimes presumably determined by the quality of a following vowel, see above. Like Aśokan, BHS has *udupāna* for *uda*°; and for *udapāsi* (Dict.) the variant *udu*° occurs.

Epenthetic vowels

3.98. MIndic epenthesis, usually in words occurring in identical form in Pali, is not rare, but almost limited to verses m.c., except for Mv which also has it in prose; even in Mv, however, it is commoner in verses.

3.99. Epenthetic a. Pali *ratana* (= AMg. etc. *rayaṇa*), for *ratna*, occurs as such or in cpds. and derivatives in the prose of Mv not rarely, elsewhere in verses and chiefly (tho not always) m.c. Even in Mv note *ratana* repeatedly in vss i.108.8 ff., while *ratnāni* occurs in prose 108.5. Prose examples of *ratana* and compounds or derivatives: Mv i.31.5; 54.7; 62.19; 63.9; 89.14; 137.5; 138.10; in i.193.16 f. (prose) stems *ratna* and *ratana* occur side by side, apparently at random. Verses where *ratna* would be metrically possible but text reads *ratana*: SP 353.2 (beginning of triṣṭubh; *ratanehi* 'hypermetric', *ratnehi* somewhat more regular); LV 109.8 *ratana-* in śārdūlavikrīḍita, *ratna-* would be more regular; *anantaratano* Mv i.55.9 = 56.15 (in āryā; °*ratno* equally good); *ratanaparvato* Mv i.113.10 (id.); *ratanajinaṃ* Mv i.119.9 (id.). Verses where meter favors *ratana*: *Prabhūtaratano* SP 252.5 (in adjoining prose °*ratna*); *ratana-* SP 11.4; 16.6; 212.11; 213.3; LV 49.14; 59.7; 167.9 etc.; in LV 292.3–5 *ratna-* and *ratana-* both occur repeatedly, as meter requires; Mv i.118.16; 119.10; 186.17; Gv 256.7; 257.11; 258.13; 259.1; 284.23; 285.12, 17; Suv 149.11 (*Ratanoccaya*, cf. *Ratnoccaya* 147.4 etc.); RP 23.10; and many others.

3.100. Another case is *araha(n)t-*, *araha-* (Pali id.), for Skt. *arhant-*, and the related adjective *araha-* = Skt. *arha-* 'worthy'. For the latter see Dict.; the former as *araho* = *arhan* Mv i.37.6 (prose); in verse where the epenthesis is not metrically necessary Mv i.247.12; where it is necessary LV 45.10; 47.9; 354.13; (in 376.11, 378.11 by em.;) Mv i.143.5; (and by em. i.101.8).

3.101. The remaining cases of epenthetic *a* are sporadic, and not always certain. Clear are *garahati* = Pali id., Skt. *garhati*; it may be called m.c.; *attāttamīya* = Pali *attattaniya*, Skt. *ātmātmīya*; *kisara* = *kṛcchra* (cf. Pali *kasira*, and Geiger 59.2); probably also *manojana* = *manojña* (vs; may be m.c.), altho no form of this word with epenthesis seems recorded in MIndic. In oblique cases of the *n* declension which in Skt. would show no *a* before *n*, we find (in vss, m.c.) not only *mūrdhanā* = Pali id., Skt. *mūrdhnā*, but also *nāmana* = *nāmnā* (Pali and Pkt. apparently only *nāmena*); see § 17.49. Others: *raśami* = Skt. *raśmi*, m.c.; no epenthesis is noted in MIndic in this word; *sukhama* (Pkt. id. and *suhama*) = *sūkṣma*; *supana* probably for *svapna*, but possibly for *svapana*; otherwise the BHS equivalent of *svapna* is only *supina*, § 3.111; *pratiśrutakā* or °*ka*, perhaps = *pratiśrutkā* with epenthesis, but may be a *ka*-extension of **pratiśruta* = AMg. *paḍisuya*, masc., Rāyapaseṇi Sutta 40, acc. to Rat-

nachandra (I have no access to this text), or of **pratiśrutā* = *pratiśrut* (§ 15.9) with shortening of *ā* m.c. (the meter is obscure to me). In Śikṣ 4.10, 11 (vss) *jātaya-*, apparently for *jātya-*, is probably an error for *jātiya-*.

3.102. Epenthetic i. Before *y*: As in MIndic generally, this is specially common before *y*. There is no correlation with the quantity of the preceding syllable ('Sievers's Law'); it is just as common after a single consonant preceded by a short vowel as otherwise. It appears standardly in certain morphological categories, which as a rule will not be dealt with at this place but in the morphology. See under oblique cases of fem. *i* and *ī* stems (*-iy-* for *-y-*, § 10.86 etc.); gerunds in *-iya*, *-iyāna* (§ 35.11 etc.); passives in *-iya-* (§ 37.4 etc.). In general it is limited to verses, but Mv shows it frequently in prose, and I have noted a case in the prose of Bbh (235.1 *pariyeṣitaiḥ*, for *parye°*). Prose cases will be identified as such, here or in the Dict. Once, at least, we find a Prakritic spelling *-ia* instead of *-iya*: *acintia*.

3.103. Very common in all texts is the adjective written *acintiya*, even in prose in Mv and in verses elsewhere (note contrariwise, e. g., *acintya* SP 7.6–7, in prose). In prose of Mv, e. g. ii.362.11. In verses: SP 30.15; 62.6 (*acintiyātaḥ* = *acintyāt*); 68.1; 176.12; LV 54.1, 4; 171.6; Divy 79.21 ff. = 469.5 ff.; Suv 23.7; 28.7; Samādh 22.29; Bhad 28; Gv 24.18 etc. Other adjectives in *iya* = *ya* are so extremely common that I am not sure they are all recorded even in the dictionary. The following, and quite a number of others, will be found there: *agaṇiya*, *avivartiya*, *anivartiya*, *aprativartiya*, *atuliya*, *amāpiya*, *karmaṇiya*, *akampiya*, *nindiya*, *praśaṃsiya*. And noun stems in *ya*: *śākiya* = *śākya*, common in prose of Mv, e. g. i.351.14; 352.15; and in vss, Mv i.43.15 = 337.11; ii.24.5; LV 76.3; 94.9, 10; 133.5; *brahmacariya*, *cariyā*, *pāricariyā*, *vīriya-(vant)*, *harmiya*. Also with MIndic shortening of a long vowel in a preceding syllable: *kariya*, *ariya* = *ārya*, *ācariya*, *viriya* (note also *vīriya*, above!), *suriya*, *turiya*, §§ 3.33, 38, 45.

3.104. In compounds (either noun cpds., or forms and derivatives of compound verbs) in which the prior element ended in *i* which in Skt. appeared as *y* before following initial vowel: *viyūha* = *vyūha*, besides citations in Dict., LV 74.12; 81.13; Mv ii.275.17 (prose); Bhad 6, 34; *viyūhana*; *triyadhva-* = *tryadhva-*; *pariyanta*; *viyākaroti*; *pariyeṣate*.

3.105. One doubtful case before the present suffix *ya*: *āpadiyema* Mv iii.74.5 (prose; for *āpadyema*, opt. to *āpadyati*; but v.l. *āpadyiyāmaḥ*).

3.106. The reverse of epenthesis occurs, possibly m.c., in *kyant* for *kiyant*, 'how many'; and (not m.c.) in *nyāma* = *niyāma*; cf. § 3.112.

3.107. Before other consonants than *y*: these cases, too, are almost limited to verses, except that Mv has them also frequently in prose. In prose of other texts I have noted only *Supināntalokamuni* Mmk 130.4 (n. pr., for *Svapnā°*). All our examples concern words which show the same epenthesis in Pali, except (*saṃ*)*spariśa* which shows it in Pkt. (cf. AMg. *pharisa*, *sampharisaṇa*).

3.108. Before *r*: *śiri*, *śirī* (also spelled with *s-*) = *śrī* LV 122.16, 18 (read *hirisiribharite*, one word); 123.2; 135.10; 272.4; 362.21; 391.4; Mv i.62.10; 142.11; 276.14; 297.11; ii.57.2, 8; 363.15; Gv 235.24; *śirimant* (*śirīmat*) Mv i.295.21; 305.18; *Mañjuśirī* (= *°śrī*); *hiri*, *hirī* = *hrī* LV 122.18; 139.6; 158.20; 292.17; 362.21; 391.4; Mv ii.59.22; 61.19 etc.; 64.3 (prose); *ahirika*; *hirīniṣevī* Ud xix.5 (so oldest ms., later var. *hrīniṣevī hi*, Sanskritizing the form and patching the meter with *hi*); *ahirī* Ud xx.5 (so oldest ms., later var. *ahrīko*, cf. preceding); *vajira* (Pali id.) = *vajra*.

3.109. Before *l*: *gilāna*, *gilānaka-tva*; *kilānta* (Pali *kilanta*) SP 363.12; LV 220.6, 8; Mv i.227.16 (prose); *akilāntaka* LV 359.20; *kilanta* (with MIndic short *a*) Mv iii.118.20; *parikilanta* Mv i.217.16; *kilamāmi* Mv i.343.5 (twice; prose); *kilamatha* (Dict.); *kileśa* (Pali *kilesa*) LV 46.3; 48.5; 53.11; 276.12; Mv i.116.16 (*dhuta°*); ii.115.2; *-upakileśa* Mv i.228.11 (prose); *kiliṣṭa* LV 131.17; Mv iii.446.1; *saṃkiliṣṭā va yas tapaḥ* Ud xi.3 (oldest ms.; later var. *saṃkliṣṭaṃ vāpi yat tapaḥ*, with Sktization and patching of meter); *śiliṣṭa* (= *śliṣṭa*, Pali *siliṭṭha*); *pilakṣa* (= *plakṣa*, Pali *pilakkha*); *milāyati* (Pali id., = *mlā°*), *milāyita*, *pramilāyita*, *milāna*, Mv ii.393.9; *āmilāta* and *saṃmilāyati*, *saṃmilāta*.

3.110. Before sibilant: *spariśa*, *saṃspariśa* = (*saṃ*)-*sparśa*.

3.111. Before nasal: in oblique case-forms of *rājan*, § 17.50; *tasiṇā* (Pali id.) = *tṛṣṇā*; *kasina* (Pali *kasiṇa*) = *kṛtsna*; *supina* (Pali id., Pkt. *suviṇa*) = *svapna*, common.

3.112. The reverse of epenthesis, hyper-Sanskritic dropping of a historic interconsonantal *i*, seems to occur in *vyavastaḥ*, apparently m.c. for *vyavasitaḥ*; cf. § 3.106.

3.113. Finally we have **prothesis** of *i* in forms of *strī*, as in Pali and Pkt. *itthi*, *itthī*. The following 'stems' are noted in our texts: *istri* or *istrī* (also *istrigāra*); *istrikā* (Pali *itthikā*, AMg. *itthiyā*). Peculiar to our dialect are the stems *iṣṭi* etc. and *iṣṭikā*, with domal *ṣṭ*; no MIndic **iṭṭhi*(*kā*) or the like seems recorded.

3.114. Epenthetic u. This occurs here only (as in MIndic usually) before or after labials. The labial precedes only in forms of *-āpunoti* (*prāpuṇoti* SP 294.8; 371.8, vss) or more usually *-āpunati* (Chap. 43, s.v. *āp*), = Pali *pāpuṇāti* etc. Otherwise the labial always follows. Most of the words concerned show the same epenthesis in Pali and Pkt. So *paduma* = *padma*, very common; in prose, Mv i.228.1; 229.8; 308.5; ii.109.4, etc.; Śikṣ 75.8, 10; in verses, SP 313.3; LV 137.21; 367.3 (read *padume* with best mss.); Ud xviii.5 (so oldest ms.; later var. *padma*); etc. Equally common in Mv, even in prose, are *śuve* (also *suve* as in Pali) and derivatives, and *duve* (Pali and Pkt. id.) = *dve* 'two' (§ 19.3). Outside of Mv it is rare: *triṃśa-duve* '32' Gv 406.15 (vs). Other forms: *-duvāra* = *dvāra*; *madhuvāsava* = Skt. and Pali *madhvās°*; *triyadhuvā* = *tryadhvā* Dbh.g. 51(77).8 (here *u* actually spoils the meter!); *sukhuma* = *sūkṣma*. The 3 pl. verb form *śṛṇvanti* appears as *śṛṇuvanti* LV 236.10; Dbh.g. 13(349).1 (both vss and may be m.c.).

Saṃprasāraṇa and the like

3.115. As in MIndic (Geiger 25; Pischel 151–2), and mostly in words and forms which also appear there, we find substitution of *i*, *ī*, *e* for *ya*, *yā*, and of *u*, *o* for *va*, *vā*. BHS presents little that is new in principle. Both Pali and Pkt. often have *vīti-* for *vyati-* at the beginning of compound verbs and their derivatives. So here *vītikrama* = Pali *vītikkama*, and others (Dict. s.vv. *vīti-*). The gerund ending *i* (*ī*) is, in my opinion, best derived from *ya* (§ 35.49). It occurs otherwise, apparently, only in Ap. The stem *cari*, *carī* 'conduct' is, I think, certainly a phonetic equivalent of *caryā*; it seems not to be recorded anywhere in MIndic, not even in Ap. It is almost limited to verses, very rare in prose, and is regularly and very commonly used m.c. for *caryā*. Quite similar are *īrṣi* = *īrṣyā*; *śayi* = *śayyā*; *ceti* = *caitya*. In Śikṣ 325.13 (from Vimalakīrtinirdeśa) *acintiṣu* certainly means *acintyeṣu* and seems to imply a stem *acinti* = *acint*(*i*)*ya*; *acint*(*i*)*yeṣu* would be metrically impossible. MSV has *abhiṣūyase* for *abhyas°* (Dict.). On *tiriccha* (implying *tiri* for *tirya*), and *tīrthikara*, perhaps for *tīrthya°*, see Dict. For *styāna* occurs *thīna* (Pali id.) and semi-Skt. *stīna*. Textually uncertain are *dvīhika*, *trīhika*, with *ī* for *ya*.

3.116. The verb *vedhati* = Pali id. is certainly a MIndic equivalent of *vyath-*. In Mv i.156.17 (vs) *tapetu*

seems to stand for (unmetr.) *tapyatu* (so Senart's note, with alleged parallels, mostly doubtful, being variant readings of only a few mss. and not favored by meter). The same may be recognized in Gv 481.1 (vs) *śikṣiṣenti*, for °*ṣyanti* (unmetr.), 3 pl. fut.

3.117. As in MIndic, *du-* occurs especially in the Mv, tho not commonly, for *dvi-*. Similarly *suda* (for *sudaṃ* = *svidaṃ*); *supana, supina* = Pali id. for *svapna*, and the verb *supiti* etc. (Pali *supati*), also *sopita* (cf. Pkt. *sovai*), both to Skt. *svapiti* (*svapati*), Chap. 43, s.v. *svap*, with *osopati* and *osopana*; *sostika* = *svastika*; *doṣa* 'hatred', for Skt. *dveṣa*, is like Pali *dosa* a homonym of Skt. *doṣa* 'fault'; *sora* m.c. for *svara*.

Loss of a syllable

3.118. Pischel 149, 150 end, and Jacobi, Ausgew. Erz. xxvi, § 16.3, call attention to the occasional loss of syllables, perhaps by contraction of vowels after loss of intervocalic stops, in MIndic. So *andhāra* = AMg. id., Skt. and Pali *andhakāra*; *manāpa* = *manaāpa*; *aṅgulīkā*, prob. for *aṅgulīyakā*; *em* = AMg. id., Skt. *evam*. An example, unknown in MIndic, seems to occur in *mṛttikama* = a theoretical Pkt. **maṭṭikama* for **maṭṭikamaya* or °*maa* = Skt. *mṛttikamaya* (for *mṛttikāmaya*, m.c.; Skt. has such cases of *mṛttika-*). Another plausible case seems to be *samanvī*, apparently for Skt. *samanvitaḥ*, implying MIndic loss of *t* and vowel contraction. Like Pali, BHS has *yāgu* or *yāgū* for Skt. *yavāgū*; and BHS only writes repeatedly *yvāgu*, °*gū*, instead of *yāgu* (in vss always two syllables); this seems to be only a strangely perverted attempt to Sanskritize the MIndic *yāgu* in writing (cf. Senart Mv i note 393). Monier Williams cites a Skt. Lex. *yvāgulī* or °*lyā*, 'sour scum of boiled rice', which I have failed to find in BR, pw, or elsewhere.

4. Saṃdhi

Loss of initial vowels in saṃdhi

4.1. In BHS, as in MIndic (see e. g. Geiger 70.2b), either of two originally adjoining vowels could be lost in saṃdhi, with or without 'compensatory lengthening' of the remaining vowel.

4.2. In the case of some particles or common 'light words', the form without initial vowel acquired, by analogical extension, a kind of status as an independent word, tho usually the form with initial vowel continued to exist. Geiger 66 lists as such forms in Pali *va* = *iva* and *eva*, *pi* = *api*, *ti* = *iti*, *dāni* = *idānīm*, *heṭṭhā* = *adhastāt*, and the pronoun stem *na* = *ena*. All these occur in BHS also (*heṭṭhā* in the form *heṣṭā*, and other related forms). The fact that such forms have come to be used independently of vocalic saṃdhi is shown by their use after a word ending in a nasal (ordinarily written *ṃ*; no other final consonant is normally tolerated in MIndic, and we very seldom find any other preceding such forms in BHS), or even at the beginning of an utterance.

4.3. We find after anusvāra, *pi* for *api* (chiefly in verses except in Mv): *tuhaṃ pi* SP 67.11; *dattaṃ pi* 95.12; *ekāṃ pi* 98.12 (? most mss. *ekā-pi*); *pūrṇaṃ pi* 99.5; *asmākaṃ pi* 147.5; *ahaṃ pi* 237.1; Av i.198.6 (prose); LV 138.6; *ekasattvaṃ pi* SP 254.10; *tvaṃ pīha* 294.10; *muhūrtaṃ pi* 336.4; in prose of Mv, *anyeṣāṃ pi* i.16.12; 18.5; *mānsaṃ pi snāyuṃ pi . . . sarvaṃ pi* 18.11–12; *nirayaṃ pi* 102.17 (Bodhisattvas may go 'even to hell'; Senart wrongly inserts *na* in preceding); *tathedaṃ pi* 158.13; *vayaṃ pi* ii.218.14; *jñātīṃ pi* iii.91.5 (? v.l. *jñātī pi*); and in vss of Mv, *sarvaratnaṃ pi* i.185.15; *vayaṃ pi* 186.16, etc.; *nāmarūpaṃ pi* Samādh 22.25.

4.4. After another consonant: *abravīt pi* Mv ii.135.14 (vs; one ms. omits *pi*, unmetrically).

4.5. *ti* for *iti*, after anusvāra (sometimes written *n*; chiefly in verses except Mv): *bhāṣitaṃ ti* SP 62.11; *mamāyaṃ ti* 113.10; *kṛtaṃ ti* 292.6; *ahaṃ ti* LV 308.11; others Mv i.8.11, 14 (prose); ii.205.11 (vs); *tuvaṃ ti* ii.216.4 (prose), etc. At the beginning of a line of verse, Mv i.104.18, meter seems to demand *ty-* for mss. *ity-ena* (Senart *ity-eva*). Certainly there is no saṃdhi with the preceding line, which ends *narottamaḥ* (all mss.).

4.6. *va* occurs for *iva* (rarely *eva*), after anusvāra, see Dict.; after another consonant: *-nidhir vā* LV 80.15 (vs; so all mss.). *dāni* (also *dāniṃ*) is common for *idānīṃ* in Mv, often after anusvāra, and even in prose; in other texts only in vss, not common. So also *heṣṭā, heṣṭe, heṣṭi, heṣṭena, heṣṭima*, etc. (also written with *ṭh* for *ṭ*), often after *ṃ* and at the beginning of sentences and lines, in prose of Mv and in verses elsewhere. The pronominal stem *na* occurs at the beginning of a prose sentence and of a line of verse (§ 21.48) and is not restricted as to a preceding final.

4.7. In other words than the above, loss of an initial vowel after final anusvāra is extremely rare, and some of the apparent examples are textually doubtful: *vagūhayet* = *ava°* Mv i.304.15 (vs; but v.l. *°mālā* for *°mālāṃ* preceding); (*ghrāṇabalaṃ vipulaṃ*) *smi* = *asmi* Gv 231.5 (vs; metrically correct); also *si* = *asi*, after consonants in prose, see § 28.64, where both these forms may belong; *dārikāṃ ham* = *aham* Gv 413.23 (vs, metrically correct); *dhigama* = *adhigama* Laṅk 144.10 = 324.5 (vs, after *rātryāṃ*, but in 144.10 v.l. *rātryā*).

4.8. In Mv i.112.14 *śīti* (see Dict.) seems to be used for *aśīti* at the beginning of a line of verse.

4.9. After a final vowel, an initial vowel is quite commonly dropped, but mostly in verses where it could be called a matter of meter; so in all the following examples except where the contrary is stated.

4.10. When the preceding final vowel is identical with the initial, of course it makes no difference whether we consider the initial or the final vowel dropped. Such cases have been classified as showing elision of the *final* vowel (§ 4.20 ff.), except when the following word is one like *api* (*pi*), *iva* (*va*), etc., which is known to be otherwise used as a monosyllable.

4.11. Initial *a* dropped: *tatha pi* = *tathāpi* SP 26.9; *daśa pi* SP 31.11; *adhimuktī* (for *°tir*, n. sg.) *pi* SP 235.10; *māṃsacakṣu sya, divyacakṣu sya* SP 355.8, 9; *ca pi* Mv i.204.9 = ii.8.4 (Senart *cāpi* with one ms. in i.204.9, but against meter; mss. in ii.8.4 are corrupt but do not support *cāpi*); *hi si* = *hy asi* Mv iii.8.14 (vs, but *hy asi* would be metrically as good, no v.l.); *kṣetra pi* Samādh 19.16; *kārī pi* Mmk 135.14 (*kāry api* would be unmetrical); *su-laṃkṛtikā* = *sv-al°* LV 322.5; *api nityā* (for *apy anityā*) LV 324.9; *paśyanti nanya-* Dbh.g. 17(353).16; *satyeṣu jñānu* (for *aj°*) Dbh.g. 27(53).13; *jñāyati raṇyagato* (= *araṇ°*) Śikṣ 329.13.

4.12. After final *ā* for *ās*: *-cittā pi* SP 84.1; *uṣṭrā tha* (for *atha*) SP 94.11; *kubjā tha* SP 95.6; *ḍamarā tha* SP 96.3; *parvatā pi* Av ii.136.10; *anutpannā niruddhāś* (for *ani°*) Samādh 8.5; *devā pi* id. 8.23; *abhāvā nakṣarāḥ* (for *ana°*) id. 8.6; *nairayikā pi* id. 19.17; *sahitā 'ṅgārāḥ* Divy 27.22. In prose of Divy: *varṣā tikrāntāḥ* 15.2; *tīrthyā bhihitāḥ* 164.1; and in prose of Av repeatedly, but regularly 'emended' by Speyer, see his note on i.20.15.

4.13. Initial *ā* dropped: in the word *ātman* and derivatives this occurs after final *e*, *o* in early and epic Skt. (cf. Edgerton, Language 19.116 note 64), and occasionally here: *bhavate 'tmabhāvaḥ* SP 353.1; 370.10; read *māno 'tmikā* LV 215.13–14 with best mss. as meter requires. And rarely in other words: *raye 'ryā* (= *āryā*) Divy 399.12 (vs, confirmed by meter).

4.14. Initial *i* dropped after vowel: *ti* for *iti* after final *-o* SP 26.6; Mv i.4.5 (prose); 112.1; 114.12; *mīmāṃsaye ti* Av i.94.3 (prose; so read with mss.; see § 38.21); *sthero ti* Ud xi.12, changed in a later v.l. to *sthaviro*, omitting *ti* and so preserving meter; *supino ti* Samādh 19.26; *va* for *iva*, Dict.; others, *ye maṃ* (= *imaṃ*) LV 57.3; *deśayiṣye māṃ* (= *imāṃ*) Suv 29.1 (so best ms., as required by meter; text *imāṃ*, unmetr.).

4.15. Initial *ī* dropped: *bhaviṣyase 'śvaravaraḥ* (= *īśvara°*) LV 326.19.

4.16. Initial *u* dropped: *kukṣau papannaḥ* (= *upa°*) LV 56.8; *kleśa-padrutāṃ* (cpd., = *kleśopa°*) LV 178.22; *anyatamo pāsakas* (= *upā°*) Divy 56.7 (prose; hardly a cpd.); in Mv i.189.16 (vs) read probably *gaccha tvarṣayo* (= *tvam*, reduced to *tva*, *ṛṣayo*; two mss. *tva ṛṣayo*) *pagamya* (= *upa°*); in RP 59.5 *utpādayecchu* is m.c. for *utpādaye(t)-ucchu* or *-icchu* (Skt. *ikṣu*).

4.17. Initial *e* dropped: *kukṣigatā va* (= *eva*) Mv

i.144.13 (prose), and others, some uncertain, Dict. s.v. *va* (2).

4.18. With compensatory lengthening of preceding vowel, elision has been noted only with *iti*, appearing as *tī*. It is however not restricted to cases where meter requires a long; indeed it even occurs in prose in *gacchatū tī* Mv i.362.10; *bhavatū tī* ii.210.11; iii.193.8; *sādhū tī* ii.491.12. In verses, but in the first two cases in metrically indifferent positions: *sādhū tī* Mv i.75.5; 76.3; 149.7; 182.10, etc. In verses, of course, any final vowel may be lengthened m.c.

4.19. Instead of lengthened final vowel, doubling of the following consonant perhaps occurs in *tti* for (*i*)*ti*, as in Prakrit (Pischel 143), in *vahiṣyāma* (so read with mss., which have *vah°* for *vadh°*; Senart *vadhiṣyāmi*) *tti* (mss. *nti*) Mv i.17.2 (prose).

Loss of final vowels in saṃdhi

4.20. This occurs only before an initial vowel. When the two vowels are identical, it makes no difference whether we consider the final or the initial vowel lost, cf. § 4.10. We have included here all such cases except those where the second word has a known form lacking the initial vowel in other positions, such as *pi* for *api*, *va* for *iva*, etc.

4.21. Final *a* is lost before initial *a* (compounds included), chiefly in verses, m.c., very often: *pañc' anūnakāḥ* SP 44.8; *c' anucaṃkramanti* SP 84.8; *c' anekā* SP 91.1; *sahasr' anekā* SP 96.9; *aṣṭ' anūnakāḥ* SP 335.8; *c' avocan* LV 50.6; *yatr' ayaṃ* Mv i.67.7; *c' anāgata* 70.1; *sahasr' arehi* iii.118.4 (compound); *c' ahaṃ* 121.5; *agr' amātyo* 365.2; *-lakṣaṇ' alaṃkṛtena* Suv 37.3 (Nobel em. *-lakṣaṇāl°*, unmetr.); *var' abhijña* RP 5.17; *tasy' adhimuktiḥ* RP 20.5, 6; *moh' avidya-* Gv 482.9 (cited Śikṣ 102.3, where note calls it 'a curious form'! it is entirely normal). Uncertain is SP 113.5 (vs) *so cā dhanī*, both edd.; acc. to KN note, all mss. *ca*, followed in Nep. mss. generally by *dhvanī* (*taṃ svaku putra dṛṣṭvā*), 'and seeing him, his own son, on the road' (*c' adhvanī*); only Kashgar rec. *dhanī* (before which *ca* would be unmetr.), but this is supported by Tib. *phyug po*, 'the rich man', and by 114.3; if this is the true reading, *cā* (or *co*), or *cad-*, must be read before it.

4.22. In prose, *dṛṣṭvān' aho* Mv i.8.11; *c' aparādhā-* (printed *ca parādhā-*) for *ca* plus *aparādhā-* Mv i.132.10 without v.l.

4.23. Final *a* or *ā* may be lost before initial *i*, chiefly in verses m.c. Such cases could be regarded as metrical shortening of theoretical *e* to *i*, but are probably better treated as elision of the prior vowel in saṃdhi. A few examples out of many: *sthitv' iha* SP 12.5; *v' imāś* 15.5 (*vā*, or *eva*, *imāś*); *mam' idaṃ* 90.2; *c' iha* 90.8; *sukhāpanārthāy' iha* 92.12; *mam' ihaṃ* 94.2 (*mama-iha*); *ady' iha* 196.4; *c' ime* 303.7; *may' iha* LV 57.7 (*mayā-iha*, not *mayi ha* with Lefm.); *yen' imau* Mv i.68.4; *yasy' iyaṃ* i.73.11, 15; *śrutv' imu* Samādh 19.33; *yasy' imu* Bhad 49. In a vs, but not m.c.: *yen' icchakaṃ* Mv ii.484.8 (= Pali id., elsewhere BHS *yenecchakam*).

4.24. Final *a* or *ā* may be lost before initial *u* or *ū*, chiefly in verses m.c.; but also, at least in compounds, in verses, and occasionally in prose, before a consonant cluster, where meter cannot be concerned. It seems that they are best regarded as instances of elision of final *a* before initial *u* or *ū*, rather than reduction of theoretical (Skt.) *o* to *u*. Note particularly *ekūna* (= Pali id., Skt. *ekona*, for *eka-ūna*) Mv ii.494.10, 18; iii.177.7 (all prose). In verses, but of course not m.c., e. g. *padumuttarāhi* Mv ii.192.16; *varuttamaṃ* ii.194.10, for Skt. *padmottarābhiḥ*, *varottamaṃ*; but the real process is probably symbolized better as *padum'-utt°*, *var'-utt°* (despite § 3.54). Cf. Geiger 67, 70. In verses m.c.: *sthāpetv' upāyaṃ* SP 91.8; *-udyān' upaśobhitaṃ* SP 196.8; *buddhabalen' upeto* SP 207.11; *c' udāraṃ* SP 214 3; *c' udagrāḥ* Mv i.83.7 (so read with most mss.; Senart *ca ud°*, unmetrically); *prajñ' upāyataḥ* RP 7.13; *prajñ-upāya* RP 5.16; etc., common everywhere.

4.25. Final *i* is lost before initial *i*, in vss m.c.; *śobhat' iyaṃ* SP 9.1; *prakāśayiṣyant' imam ekayānam* SP 53.8; *bhont' imi* SP 92.3 (= *bhavanti-ime*); *naivāst' iha* SP 93.8; *ābharaṇān' imāni* SP 96.14; *jvalant' ime 'dya* SP 165.2, so read with all Nep. mss. (which must intend this; cited as *jvalanti megha* in KN note); edd. with Kashgar rec. *jvalanti adya*, which leaves *jvalanti* without a subject and is a lect. fac.; *muñcām' imaṃ* Mv ii.183.20; *deśay' ito vā* Bhad 54 (so analyze, ed. *deśayito vā*).

4.26. Also before dissimilar vowels, in verses: *vrajat' āyu* LV 173.14 = *vrajaty āyu* (which is metrically impossible), 'life passes'; *citrāṇi* (so read with mss.) *yajñanayutān' api yaṣṭa pūrve* (adverb) LV 340.15 (here, to be sure, *°tāny api* would be equally good metrically, but there is no v.l., and *citrāṇi* proves the form intended as *°nayutāni*).

4.27. So also final *u*, before initial *u*, in verses, m.c.: *bah' udikṣiṣu* LV 364.11 = *bahu udīkṣ°*, 'they have looked longingly for . . .'; Tib. *sdod* (= wait) *ciṅ mchis*; *snigdhamṛd' upadiśyate* Mv i.85.16 (so 4 of 6 mss.; Senart with v.l. *°mṛdūpa°*, inferior metr.).

4.28. Final *e* may be similarly lost before an initial vowel, possibly thru an intermediate reduction to *a* or *i*: *sarv'* (= *sarve*) *imi* SP 117.3; *śṛṇut'* (= *śṛṇute*) *ekagāthām* SP 351.1; *meṣa* = *me eṣā* Gv 257.5 = 26 (vs, m.c.).

4.29. Not only an original or theoretical Skt. final vowel may be elided before an initial vowel, but the endings (Sanskrit) *as*, *ās*, *ān*, *am*, *ām* (all of which in BHS may be reduced to *a*, at least in verses, §§ 4.32, 33) may be similarly treated. Examples are rarely found in prose, chiefly in verses when meter requires the elision.

as: *aprāpt' imām uttamam agrabodhim* SP 92.11 'he has not attained this . . .'; *kurvant' imam* SP 194.4; *marut' āgata* LV 114.20 (*marutas-āgatās*); *bhavant'* (most mss. *°nto*, unmetr.; ed. *bhavann*) *anukampya* LV 115.10. In prose: *anāthapiṇḍadāha* Av i.37.3 = *anāthapiṇḍada* (n. sg.) *āha*.

ās: *dharm' ime* LV 175.21; 176.19; *śānt' ādinirmalāḥ* Samādh 8.6; *parvat' aneke* Samādh 19.19.

ān: (*a*)*ntarakalp' anekān* SP 94.4; *kalp' anantān* Mv ii.337.13.

am: *yānanānātv' upadarśayanti* SP 46.12; *im' evarūpam* SP 95.12; 97.6; 115.3; 291.10; *sarv' aśeṣataḥ* SP 115.9; *mārg' anuttaraṃ* SP 116.4; *trisāhasr' ima lokadhātuṃ* SP 157.12; *phal' evarūpam* SP 325.8; *drumarājamūl' upagataḥ* LV 292.18; *mahy' adya* Mv i.186.9 (so all mss., Senart *ādya*); *śaky' antarikṣaṃ* Mv ii.348.4; *nūn' ahaṃ* Suv 226.3 (text *aham*, meter demands *ahaṃ* or, with 3 mss., *nūnam aham*, two shorts for long); 237.8; *sarv' adhimucyami* Bhad 3 (= *sarvam*, or *sarvaḥ*?); *viriy' ārabhante* Dbh.g. 13(349).8; *udān' udānayī* (so divide) Gv 489.11. Once in prose SP 390.1, KN print *im-evaṃrūpam*, probably by misprint (tho not corrected in Corrigenda); WT read *imam ev°*, stating that their ms. K′ reads so.

ām: *nānādhimuktān' iha prāṇikoṭinām* SP 45.3; *balān' aho* SP 87.6; *teṣa kāye aśraddadhantān' ima buddhabodhim* SP 95.8; *teṣ' anuśikṣamāṇāḥ* SP 203.10; *maharddhikān' aṣṭavimokṣadhyāyinām* SP 205.12; *prakāśayantān' iha* SP 229.9; *cary'* (= *caryām*) *anuśikṣamāṇāḥ* SP 310.4; *sugatān' iha* (WT *ihā*, m.c.) SP 359.3; *bodhisattvān' iha* LV 311.15.

4.30. Once the ending *-ānām*, gen. pl., seems to be reduced before a vowel to *-a* (or, with 'hiatus-bridging' *m*, v.l. *-am*): *daśāna co antarakalpa* (v.l. *°pam*) *atyayāt* SP 190.7 'and after the lapse of 10 intermediate kalpas'.

Lengthening of vowel after loss of preceding final

4.31. In MIndic (Geiger 67, 70), the unelided vowel in such cases may be lengthened. Certain instances of

this are rare in our language. In SP 428.11 (prose!) KN read *yenīyaṃ* (= *yena-iyaṃ*) without v.l., but WT with their ms. K′ *yeneyaṃ*. In SP 85.9 (vs) the Kashgar recension is said to read *jalūṣita* (Nep. mss. mostly *saṃtūṣita*); WT em. *jvālūṣita*; the meaning is certainly 'burnt by flames', and the correct reading involves saṃdhi of *jala* (= *jvala*, a doubtful stem) or *jvālā* (or an equivalent) with *uṣita*. In Mv i.69.8 (vs) read *vaya* (m.c.; mss. *vayaṃ*) *pi khādya* (so mss.; = *khu*, for *khalu*, plus *adya*; Senart *vayam apy adya*, which is unmetrical). Also a theoretical (Skt.) final *am*, presumably first reduced to *a*, may be elided with lengthening of the following initial vowel: *var' ūpagatu* LV 135.6 = *varam upagato*.

a in saṃdhi for *as*, *ās*, *am*, *ām*, *an*, *ān*, *e*

4.32. Final Skt. *as*, in MIndic regularly appearing in the generalized saṃdhi form *o*, is in our language very commonly reduced to *a* (as well as *u*, §§ 3.52, 53), but almost exclusively in verses m.c. Occurrences in case endings of nouns, nom. sg. masc. of *a*-stems etc., are illustrated in the appropriate sections of the morphology. In verb inflection it occurs especially in the variation of *ma* with *mas* (*mo*) in 1 pl. forms, where it is certainly not wholly phonetic but partly morphological in origin (§§ 26.5, 6). Here we shall mention a few cases of adverbial forms, all from verses and apparently m.c. They may perhaps be interpreted as representing Skt. *aḥ* with MIndic loss of visarga. But since all such forms could also contain *o*, without regard to saṃdhi, this correspondence led, in our language, to the introduction by analogy of *o* as a metrical lengthening of final *a* (§§ 3.79–88). Examples: *sarvata* SP 92.10; *bhūya* SP 96.2; LV 49.16; Mv ii.319.20; *purata* LV 57.7; *kuta yaṃ* = *kuto 'yaṃ* LV 177.3; *yoniśa* LV 188.19; *tata* Mv ii.345.2 (= *tato*; wrongly interpreted in Senart's note).

4.33. Similarly for *a* or *ā* which in Skt. was final except for a following nasal, BHS often shows unnasalized *a* (or *ā*). Examples will be found in the sections of the morphology where such endings are treated.

4.34. The *a* which, according to the preceding sections, may represent Skt. *as*, *ās*, *am*, *ām*, *an*, *ān*, or also *e* (which even in Skt. becomes *a* before any other vowel than *a*), may be treated in saṃdhi exactly like any (Skt.) final *a*. Thus we have already seen that it may be elided before any initial vowel (§ 4.29). It may also be fused with such an initial vowel, producing the same result which Skt. final *a* would produce. So we find, first, *e* and *ai* resulting from theoretical *as* or *aḥ*, *ās* or *āḥ*, plus *i* and *e* respectively (chiefly in verses m.c.):

bhikṣaveti (= °*vaḥ-iti*) SP 10.2; *makareva* (*-iva*) LV 175.11; *jvalaneva* (*-iva*) LV 175.12; *megheva* (*-iva*) LV 339.3; *jātamātreha* (*-iha*) Divy 389.20; *pavaneva* (*-iva*) Samādh 19.29.

samāhitaikāsani (°*hitaḥ-ekāsane*) SP 193.10; *marutaivam* (°*taḥ-evam*) LV 115.3; *praviṣṭaikas* (°*ṭaḥ-ekas*) Divy 391.25.

(Sanskrit *-āḥ*:) *tasyaiva* (= *tasyāḥ-eva*) *rātryā*(*ḥ*) Mv i.231.3 (prose); *yasyeha* (= *yasyāḥ-iha*) Mv i.199.9 = ii.3.7. (vs).

4.35. Similarly *o* results from *as*(*aḥ*) plus *u*: *tatottari* LV 154.7 (prose; the only v.l. cited is *tatontari*, which evidently intends *tatottari*; Calc. *tata uttaraṃ*, obviously an em.) for *tataḥ-uttari*; *paratopasargaḥ* Divy 566.15, 17 (vs, printed as prose), for *parataḥ-upa*°; (in vss) *itocchṛtaḥ* (*itaḥ-ucchritaḥ*) SP 235.14; *praṇāyakopāya* (*praṇāyakaḥ-upāyaṃ*) SP 196.5; *narādhipovāca* (°*paḥ-uv*°) Mv i.151.12; *socyate* (*sa-uc*°) Samādh 8.6; *kutottaro* (*kutaḥ-ut*°) RP 6.13; *uṣṇīṣodgato* (= *uṣṇīṣaḥ-ud*°) RP 6.18. Cf. also *ā* resulting from *as* (*aḥ*) plus *ā* in *anāthapiṇḍadāha* (prose, § 4.29).

4.36. Further, Skt. final *am*, *ām* plus *a* yields *ā*, in verses m.c.: *teṣāgrataḥ* SP 98.4, 6; 99.6 = *teṣām agrataḥ*; *evāprameyā* SP 158.5 = *evam apr*°; *evāpramāṇā* SP 330.11; *sarvakāyādṛśāsi* LV 195.15 = °*yam ad*°; *vīryāpi* LV 340.22 = *vīryam api* (v.l. *vīryaṃ ca*). And original *am*, *ām* combines with *i*, *e*, *u* to *e*, *ai*, *o*; once in prose, *parameti* LV 102.9 for *paramam iti*, all mss.: 'certainly, he said'. In vss: *pramāṇaiṣāṃ* SP 305.1 = °*ṇam eṣāṃ* (WT °*ṇ' eṣāṃ* with v.l.); *teṣeti* LV 195.7 = *teṣām iti* (most mss. *drakṣyanti*, but Tib. de dag supports the pronoun); *vāyuvegavidhuteva* Mv i.68.20 (= °*tam iva*), so mss. (except °*vidhū*°, unmetr.); *deśopa*° Suv 155.7 = *deśam upa*°.

4.37. Similarly final *e*, thru intermediate *a*, fuses with initial *ū* to *o* in *rājatorṇa* RP 7.1 (vs, for *rājate* plus *ūrṇā*); and perhaps in *sacāsya* Mv i.323.21 (prose, = *sace* or *sacet* plus *asya*; but note that *saca* occurs, tho rarely, for *sacet*, before consonants and not m.c.).

o for *as* before voiceless, before pause, and for *ar*

4.38. Very common is generalization of *o* for *as*, the presonantic form, as in MIndic, before voiceless consonants and pause. It occurs even in the prose of LV: *ojopati* LV 278.10 (Lefm. em. *ojāpati*); *kumāro strī*° LV 187.5 (all mss., Lefm. em. *kumāra*; voc. is impossible). And in the prose of Mv: *mano pra-* i.3.14; *bhūyo pari-* 15; *adhośirā* 5.4; *manokarmāś* 134.6; etc., very common. In most texts only in vss, as *bhūyo pari-* SP 84.4; *-klamatho spṛśen* SP 258.8; also at the end of stanzas, *saṅgo* Samādh 19.31. Very common.

4.39. As in Pali, *o* may represent Skt. final *ar*: *antonagarāto* Mv iii.185.4 (prose); same word in line 12 *antarna*° Senart, but mss. *antena*°, *antana*°; *antogatehi* (Pali *antogata*, Skt. *antargata*) Mv i.237.10 (prose); *puno bhomy* SP 324.6; *puno 'tha* LV 125.12; *puno adya* LV 215.18 (vs; so Lefm.; but reading uncertain; perhaps read with v.l. *punār adya*, for *punar adya* m.c.). Cf. next.

Other cases of final *r* in saṃdhi

4.40. On the other hand, final *ar* may appear as *a*, with loss of *r*, on the analogy of final *as*, before a non-*a* vowel: *bharta* (= *bhartar*) *iti* LV 227.6 (prose; so all mss. and Lefm.).

4.41. Final *-is* of an ending, before initial *r*, is written as unlengthened *i* in all mss. in *-paṭākābhi* (for °*bhis*) *ratna-* LV 367.9 (prose).

4.42. Also, *r* may be retained as such before a consonant, even a voiceless, if the mss. can be trusted; *punar punaḥ* (but v.l. *punaḥ punaḥ*) Mv iii.294.12; *prādurkare* Mv ii.280.15; so also one ms. in 16 and 18, where Senart reads *prādurakare* as v.l. intends; all are in prose; *adhar-diś*, for *adho-diś*, see Dict. Once the text of Mv (ii.89.6) even writes *bhikṣavar* (= °*vas*, °*vo*) *yuṣmākam* without note of variant; and so *āyurkṣayā* (v.l. *āyuḥ*°) Mv iii.65.17, where *r* represents *s*.

Miscellaneous vocalic saṃdhi

4.43. Reduction of final *e* to *a* before initial *a* seems to occur in *spṛśiṣya* (= °*ye*) *an*° Mv ii.404.2 (vs, probably m.c.).

4.44. Final *ā* shortened before initial vowel. This is a doubtful change, which has no parallel in MIndic so far as I know, and for which I have noted only a single case: *prakampita upary-* SP 414.2, in prose. The preceding noun is *iyaṃ . . . lokadhātuḥ*, so that the pple. should be *prakampitā*, which one ms. reads; other vv.ll. are °*taḥ*, and *prakampati* (which seems clearly lect. fac.). WT keep the form without note.

4.45. If the mss. may be trusted, it seems that *ā* and even short *a* plus *ṛ* sometimes result in *ār*. In LV 234.18 (vs) Lefm. reads *-maṇḍitā* (voc. sg., so frequently

in this context) *ṛṣi-*, which is unmetrical; no ms. has the 'regular' *-maṇḍitarṣi-*, but some have *-maṇḍitārṣi-*, which is metrically possible. In LV 290.14 (prose) both edd. and apparently all mss. *yenārddhy-*, for *yena ṛddhy-*: Weller does not notice this. In the text of Mv *sarvārtuka* occurs (once) for Skt. *sarvartuka*, derived from *sarva-ṛtu-*; the Pali *sabbotuka* (*sabba-utu*) also occurs as *sarvotuka* or *°duka* (Dict.).

4.46. Once, at least, the mss. record *āy* for final *ai* before a vowel: *tasmāy ahaṃ* LV 403.6 (prose; so all mss.).

4.47. Final vowels which in Skt. would be uncombinable (pragṛhya) may undergo combination with a following vowel (rarely): *jāyāpatīti* Divy 259.3 (prose; *jāyāpatī*, dual, plus *iti*).

4.48. Saṃdhi of the pronouns *sa*, *eṣa*. These often appear, as in MIndic, in the generalized saṃdhi forms *so*, *eṣo*, in verses of most texts, and in the prose of Mv. So before voiced consonants, e. g. RP 12.12, and before voiceless, e. g. Bhad 55; both are very common.

4.49. On the other hand, there are also recorded occurrences of *sa*, *eṣa* in which the final *a* is fused in saṃdhi with a following vowel (as in the Rigveda): *eṣaiva* = *eṣa eva* SP 201.7 (prose; so KN with Nep. mss.; WT with Kashgar rec. *eṣa eva*); *sātivibuddha* (= *so 'ti°*) LV 415.4 (vs); *sopaguptaś* (= *sa upa°*) Divy 386.14 (prose); *sārāmikas* (= *sa ār°*) Av i.37.12 (prose). We saw above (§§ 4.29, 32) that any final *as* may be treated as *a*.

4.50. Note also *saḥ Śākyamunis* Suv 152.11 (vs); meter requires a long syllable for Skt. *sa*, but the normal (MIndic) *so* would do as well.

Hiatus

4.51. Like Pali (Geiger 67), BHS very often keeps unchanged, with hiatus, two adjoining vowels in the seam of compounds; and a fortiori between separate words. This phenomenon is extremely common in verses everywhere, and in the prose of many texts, particularly Mv, but also others, such as LV (especially, it seems, when the second vowel is *ṛ*). Texts which show it little or not at all in prose may be suspected of having been adapted to standard Skt. in the course of tradition. At any rate, the constant occurrence in verses is regularly confirmed by meter. Such orthography in violation of meter is very rare; but cf. *cyuti-upapatti-* Mv i.9.3, where meter seems to demand *cyutyupapatti-* (or *cyut'-upa°*).

4.52. First, in compounds. It is to be noted that editors often divide wrongly, not recognizing cpds. intended in the text, or writing as cpds. what are in fact separate words. Such cases are corrected silently in the following.

4.53. In prose: *-pūrvavideha-aparagodānīya-uttarakuruṣu* Mv i.6.2; *chinna-iryāpathā* (Senart em. *īryā°*) 22.11; *mahā-udyāneṣu* 32.4; *-bhojanīya-āsvādanīyena* 38.7; *-vana-udyānam* 216.3; *deva-ṛddhīye . . . rāja-ṛddhīye* 223.9; in a series of parallel formulas, *nīla-uṣṇīṣā*, *pītoṣṇīṣā*, *maṃjiṣṭha-uṣṇīṣā*, *lohita-uṣṇīṣā*, *śvetoṣṇīṣā*, *haritoṣṇīṣā*, *vyāyukta-uṣṇīṣā*, 259.14 to 261.6; *mahā-udyānam* 299.19; *rāja-ṛṣiḥ* 353.9; *eka-ekā* (āmreḍita) 359.16; *śyāma-ṛṣisya* ii.213.1, 3; *-siṃha-ukkāsitaṃ* 281.12 ff., etc., common in Mv; *prahāṇa-ṛddhi* LV 8.5, 15; 181.18; 426.7–8; *-vyāghra-ṛkṣa-* 306.7; *rāja-ṛddhyā* Av i.338.3; *svabhāva-ṛjukaḥ* Śikṣ 324.6; *abhīkṣṇāpatti-āpadyanatā* KP 119.2; *mahā-ṛṣayai* (instr. pl.!) *aneka-mahā-ṛṣiśata-* Mmk 18.20.

4.54. In verses, always in accord with meter: *nirodha-utpāda-* SP 117.3; *cāritra-ācāra-* 129.1; *vihāra-udyān' upaśobhitaṃ* 196.8; *mahā-abhijñāsu* 204.11; 205.9; *ananta-aupamya-* 222.1; *bodhi-arthikaḥ* 295.5; *śāśvata-uccheda-* Laṅk 25.5 (cf. *śāśvatoccheda-* in another vs, 22.10); *udyāna-ārāma-* LV 28.4; *-praśānta-upaśānta-* 46.4; *paramarūpa-upetā* (read as one cpd., and m.c. *-ūpitā* for *-upetā*) 54.7; *sa-indrakāḥ* 54.13; *kṣamā rajo-anākulā* 75.19; *su-ākarā* 114.15; *araṇi-ucchritena* 116.14; *purima-ṛṣibhi* 163.20; *viṣakṛta-iṣuṇā* 166.5; *-tṛṣṇa-avidya-* 173.15; *ratisaukhya-anvitaḥ* 215.4; *gajabhujasaṃnibha-ūruṇikāṃ* 322.21; *bodhi-aṅgāḥ* 340.20; *su-utthitā* 389.8; *vanadeva-anila-* Mv i.171.2; *nandi-āvarta* ii.304.17 (Senart em. *nandiyāv°*); *vara-agrabodhiṃ* 341.7; *sa-indrakā* 405.13; *citta-utpādo* Samādh 22.43; *aneka-āyāsa-sahasra-ākulā* Suv 39.1 (so citation of passage Śikṣ 218.2; mss. of Suv *°vyākulā* or the like, avoiding the last hiatus); *varadharma-ulkā* Suv 62.5; *catudvīpa-īśvaraḥ* 146.11; *vīrya-upāyaiḥ* RP 4.4; *bodhi-aṅga-* 11.10; *-carī-adhimukti-* Bhad 7; *śaikṣa-aśaikṣa-* 9; *padma-āsane* Gv 25.18; *buddha-āsane* 34.6, etc.

4.55. In separate words hiatus is equally common in verses everywhere, and in prose of some texts, especially Mv, but also LV. In the prose of most texts it is rare, probably owing to Sanskritization in the course of tradition. A few prose examples (in Mv and LV they could be multiplied indefinitely) where no pause in speech between the words is conceivable: *-siṃhena agra-* Mv i.3.9; *tasya abhūṣi* 13; *etena upāyena* 15; *pārṣṇi* (acc. sg.) *upādāya* 6.4; *te evaṃ* 8.1; *tadā āsi* 48.16; *eva ṛddhau* LV 14.20–1; *eva ṛddhyā* 15.13; *-pari antaḥ-* 15.17–18; *cakravartī aśvaratnena* 16.7; *dhvajāgre ucchrāpayitvā* 16.22.

4.56. In verses, always in accord with meter: *dharmeṣu anāsraveṣu* SP 61.12; *-dhātuki agra-*, and *deśayiṣyāmi anāgate* 61.13; *dharmeṣu aho* 62.2; *-jñānātu aci°* 62.6; *dṛṣṭvā ca anyān* 62.10; *saṃdhāya etat* 62.11; *vyākurvasi agra-* 63.4; *ca āsīn* 63.5; *na eṣa* 64.2; *vividhāś ca sattveha* (= *sattvā[ḥ] iha*) *ayaṃ ca agnir* (so with v.l., KN *agni*) 86.10; *'smī* (so with Nep. mss. and WT for KN *'smi*) *iha* 87.3; *putrehi* (WT em. *puttehi*) *aputrakasya*, *ihāgninā ime* 87.4; *smara ananta-* LV 11.16; *mā upekṣasva* 11.17; *paramā* (voc. sg.) *upekṣakā* 53.16; *ye idam* Suv 5.3; *jinasya antikam* Samādh 8.26; *ca artham* 8.31; *śrutva adharmāṃ* (with mss., acc. pl.) 19.33; *ca akṣaya-* Bhad 4, 31; *ca ahaṃ* 16; etc.

'Inorganic' saṃdhi-consonants or 'Hiatus-bridgers'

4.57. On this phenomenon in Pali cf. Geiger 73. In BHS the situation is approximately the same. Both *m* and *r* are very commonly so used; *d* is rare but seems certainly to occur in a few cases; *n* is still rarer and less certain. The use of *y* in this way is rare and special.

4.58. The saṃdhi-consonant is very often inserted before an initial vowel when the preceding vowel has become final by MIndic alterations. It also occurs between parts of a compound word, as well as between separate words. Tho commonest in verses, it is found also in prose, especially that of Mv.

4.59. m as saṃdhi-consonant. This is much commoner than any of the others, and occurs more or less everywhere, tho more commonly in verses than in prose. Prose passages in the following are so marked. *dadanti dānān' ima-m-evarūpā* SP 14.1 (*ima* = *imāni*); *dvihasta-mātrā-m-anucaṅkramanti* 84.8 (Kashgar rec.); *saṃtāpitā agnina-m-alpapuṇyāḥ* 85.11 (Kashgar rec.); *svaka-m-atra putrān* 86.5 (acc. pl.; so with mss.); *antarakalpa-m-eva ca* 91.4 (so ed. with Kashgar rec.; acc. pl.); *ihaiva-m-āgataḥ* 115.8 (so ed. with Nep.). — *tayaiva-m-ṛddhyā* Laṅk 12.5–6 (prose), = *tayaivarddhyā*; cf. *tayaiva śobhayā* 12.10. — *pañca-m-anūnakāni* (text *°ri*) LV 28.19; *sarva-m-anubhokti-kriyā* (acc. pl. fem.) 45.12; *śakra-m-api ca* (nom. sg.) 92.9, 13; *kila-m-itaḥ* 110.11; *lakṣaṇacitritāṅga-m-anagho* (nom. sg.) 130.16; *yatha-m-agnikhadā* 174.1 (so prob. read with best ms. A); *iha-m-ākulam* 178.21; *sthita-m-abhūd gopā* (n. sg. fem.) 194.7; *pṛthivī prakampita-m-abhūc* 194.9; *sarve ābharaṇā vikīrṇa patitā-m-uhyanti te vāriṇā* 194.17 (confirmed by Tib. khyer bar gyur ba 'become carried away'; note *bhūṣaṇā uhyamānā* 195.19); *vijahya-m-āntaḥpuri*

211.7 'abandoning the women of the harem'; *iha-m-āgamiṣye* 231.19; *yatha-m-iva* 242.5 (so ed. with best ms., others *yathā iva*, unmetr.); *dharmarāja-m-anaghe* (loc. sg., *-a* for *-e*) 281.15; *vidu-m-āhuḥ* 324.1 'the sages say' (so Tib.); *ca-m-anubhaviyā* 329.3 (= *ca-anubhūya*); *varteṣyi-m-asya* 337.5 (so with best mss.; = *vartayiṣye-asya*); *pāṇina-m-asiṃ pragṛhītva* 338.12 'with the hand', instr.; *yathā-m-anugatā* 353.7; *śaraṇu tava-m-upema* 365.18.—In vss of Mv, *girāya-m-anupūrvaśaḥ* i.10.7 (instr.); *eṣa-m-abhiyo* 44.1 'this Abhiya' (so most mss., v.l. *eṣo a°*, unmetr.; Senart em. *eṣa a°*); *rājā-m-aham-iha-m-ud-* 108.8 (so mss.; Senart em. *rājā ahaṃ idam ud-*; meter requires *ahaṃ*, otherwise read with mss.); *iva-m-ahaṃ* 116.13; *vijānati-m-ālapantaṃ* 155.4 (so all mss., Senart em. *°ti ā°*); *bodhyitvā-m-atulāṃ* 170.9; *sthihiya-m-antarato* 203.12; *aparimeya-m-ito kalpe* 251.16 (Senart em. *°ye-ito*); *tava-m-etat* 279.20; *jalpa-m-acintya-* 284.14 (*jalpa* = *jalpan*); *sthita-m-apsarāṇāṃ* ii.316.13 (Senart em. *sthitā*, unmetr.); *nayutā-m-anantā* 341.5 (so mss., acc. pl.); *buddhitva-m-uttamāṃ bodhiṃ* 354.4 = iii.278.8 (so Senart second time with both mss.; and so one ms. first time); *tatra-m-akāsi* iii.139.11; *viditva-m-ud°* 139.12; 140.6; *kṛtvāna-m-añjalim* 345.18. In prose of Mv, *hrada-m-iva accho* i.237.12 (n. sg. m.); *atīta-m-adhvāne* 271.19; 283.14; ii.209.9 (loc. sg.); *gaccha-m-anujānāpehi* i.256.14 (*gaccha* = *gacchan*); *brāhmaṇapariṣāya-m-eva sakāśāto* 311.8 (gen. sg.); *so eva-m-eṣo kumāro* ii.110.17 'this prince is none but he' (*eva*, not *evam*); *gāthāya-m-adhyabhāṣati* 207.4 (instr.; v.l. *gāthāye adhya°*); *jāne-m-ahaṃ* 214.9 (so with mss.); *bhūmī-m-adhigantavyā* 280.6 (so with 1 ms.); *adya-m-aham* 404.18. — *upaparīkṣya-m-upaparīkṣya* Divy 230.9 (prose; falsely emended p. 707); *śrutā ca vāca-m-api* 390.18 (m.c. for *vācā*); *kiṃcana-m-iti* 534.23 (end of line of vs; ed. prints double daṇḍa after *kiṃcanam*!). — *nāvagāhanto-m-anadhimucyamānāḥ* KP 139.3; *te-m-anadhimucyamānā(ḥ)* 139.5 (both prose; Tib. ma mos, confirming the neg.). — *prahīnakrodhasya-m-anāsravasya* Ud xix. 3 (Pali equivalent Dhp. 94 *pahīnamānassa anāsavassa*). — *atīta-m-adhvanī* Samādh 8.21 (for *atīte 'dhvani*); *pramāṇaṃ kalpa-m-ākhyāto* 22.52 (for *kalpa-ḥ*). — *vācā-m-anu-* Suv 151.15; 152.20. — *sahitva-m-aśeṣam* RP 21.5; *tyakta-m-aṅguli udārā* 24.1; *tena-m-aprayukto* 25.16 (printed *tena ma pra°*); *taiḥ kāñcano bhāra-m-ivāpaviddhaḥ* 35.16 'as it were a load (*bhāraḥ*) of gold cast off'. — *-kalpa-m-akhinnaḥ* Bhad 25, 44 (*-kalpa* for *-kalpān*). — *dharmagaṇḍī-m-ākoṭyamānā* Kv 36.17 (prose; n. sg.). — *puṇyagandha-m-anantaka* Mmk 4.26 (prose; voc. sg.); *-vigrahā-m-abhilekhyāḥ* 62.6 (prose, n. pl.); *devaputrau-m-abhilekhyau* 64.6 (prose; dual); *buddha-m-ivotpannāḥ* 74.5 (prose) 'originated like the Buddha' (n. sg.); *nātyāśī-m-alpabhojī vā* 103.19 (n. sg.); *cāpi-m-āruhet* 119.2; *nu-m-ālikhet* 132.4; *pūrvāyāṃ diśi-m-āśritya* 205.26.

4.60. Between parts of compound words, *-m-* is used in the āmreḍitas *anyamanya-* = Skt. *anyonya*, *ekameka-* = *ekaika* (see Dict.), and *aṅga-m-aṅge* LV 223.15 (n. pl.). Other examples: *ṛddhi-m-asaṅgata-maitri-balaṃ* LV 287.9 (so Tib.; wrongly divided in Lefm.); *yuga-m-antarasmi* 338.11 (= *yugāntare*); *devā-nāga-m-abhiṣṭuto* 402.12 'praised by devas and nāgas'; *eka-m-ante* = Pali id., Skt. *ekānte* (Dict.); *aśoka-m-āhvaya*, see Dict. s.v. *aśokāhvaya*; *aśubhakarma-m-atipravaṇṇaiḥ* Mv i.84.3 (so read, see Dict. s.v. *pravaṇṇa*); *raśmi-pratoda-m-uṣṇīṣā* 259.16; 260.1; *divasa-m-āhāreṇa* 302.6, 8 (prose) 'daily food' (or is *divasam* an adverb? cf. *daivasikaṃ*, line 14); *śākyarāja-m-udyāne* ii.204.10 'in the Śākya-king's park'; *sarva-m-anavadyagātro* 220.10 (cf. Skt. *sarvānavadyāṅga*); *taṇḍula-m-āhāratāye* 231.10 (prose; in parallel phrases just before, *kolāhāratāye*, *tilāhāratāye*; Senart wrongly prints *°āharatāye* each time, with v.l. in some instances); *muni-m-īśvaratve* 341.9 'in the sage's power' (so read with 1 ms., the other corrupt; Senart em. violently); *mūla-phala-m-akṛṣṭa-ṃcha-vṛttiko* iii.382.17 (prose); *rājatva-m-aiśvarya-priyatā* Suv 100.16; *varṣaśata-m-anekaiḥ* RP 32.9; *satyārjavakṣaya-m-upāya-nayaiḥ* (read *°rjavākṣaya°*, i. e. *°rjava-akṣaya°*) 52.11; *vīrya-dhyāna-m-upāya-śodhitaṃ* 54.19; *puṇya-jñāna-m-upāya-prajñato* 55.13; *śvabhra-kedāra-m-auṣarye* Mmk 113.11; *pitta-m-utthānād* 146.7; *loka-m-agrais* 148.17; *adha-m-ūrdhva-* Gv 518.4 (prose; for *adha-ḥ*); Laṅk 28.1 (text *°ūrdhāś*).

4.61. r as saṃdhi consonant. Tho less common than *m*, *r* is also familiarly used in this way, chiefly in verses; prose examples are so marked. As in Pali, *ati-r-iva* is common for Skt. *atīva*, but only in Mv (Dict.). Also, but only in verses, *yatha-r-iva*, which is cited once in PTSD, rendered 'just as', but analyzed as *yathā* plus *iva*; the meaning in both Pali and BHS suggests *eva* rather than *iva* (to be sure BR cite a few cases of *yathā* and *iva* both in the same clause, but never in this order and always attached to different words). Occurrences of *yatha-r-iva* 'as, just as' are (all verses) SP 14.9 *°va Gaṅgavālikāḥ*, 'just like the sands of the Ganges' (in number); 32.11 id.; LV 55.10; 167.4 *°va_purimā*, 'just as the former ones'; Sukh 8.11; Śikṣ 303.9 and 304.10 (both passages in Mv, ii.382.5 and 383.6, but Mv has different meter and reads only *yatha* both times). This meaning is clearly demonstrated by *tatha-r-iva*, paralleled by *tathaiva* (with *eva*, not *iva*), 'just so, also', in LV 240.17 *tatha-r-iva dvāri tathaiva vātayāne*. All of these passages are in verses, so that one might think *-iva* used for *-eva* m.c.; but the Pali *yatha-r-iva* occurs in prose DN i.90.17. I believe that only the meaning of *eva*, never that of *iva*, fits in every case.

4.62. Other examples: *labdhvā* (cited *labdhā*) *ca mūrdhnā-r-iha dhārayeta* SP 99.2 (so prob. read with v.l. for text *labhitva ca mūrdhani dhār°*, unmetrical); *dṛṣṭo na jātu-r-asmābhir* 306.13; *śṛṇu-r-asya* LV 36.17 (? but should be pl.; two mss. *-śṛṇuntasya*, Calc. *śṛṇutāsya*; read the latter or *°thāsya*?); *bodhihetu-r-aprameya* 170.14 (*°hetu*, adverb); (*jagi-r-ūrmicuti* LV 173.13, so ed., but read *jagi janmacyutiḥ* as in citation of this line Śikṣ 204.1;) *giri-r-iva acalaṃ* LV 329.20 (acc. sg.: 'him, immovable as a mountain'; but *girir* may be nom. used as acc., § 10.60); *c' osarī-r-ātmabhāvā* LV 357.3 (read so, or with v.l. *c' osarī ātma°*, for Lefm. em. *svośarīr*; 3 sg. aor. of *ava śirati*); *saṃdhiṣu-r-ayaṃ* Mv i.97.17 (so read with most mss.; Senart omits *r* by em.); *āśu-r-eva* 217.18, 218.6; repeated ii.19.19, 20.5, where Senart also *āśu-r-eva* by em., but mss. *āśu-n-* and *āśu eva(ṃ*; with hiatus) respectively; *paranirmitavaśavartina-r-iti* i.229.16 (prose; so one ms.; Senart with v.l. *°na iti*); *bhagavata-r-ardha-* iii.301.2 (prose; v.l. *°to ardha-*; gen. sg.); *sattvā-r-āryadharmacakraṃ* 320.6 (prose); *sādhu-r-arth-* 345.20 (so mss.; Senart em. *sādhu arth-*); *bhoti-r-upetaḥ* Bhad 52; *pañca-r-aṣṭābhiḥ* Mmk 59.26; *vyomni-r-iva* 111.3 (prose); *tri-*(text *tṛ-*)*sapta-r-aṣṭa ekaṃ vā* 120.10; *niśi-r-eva* 213.22, 25; *devaiś ca-ṛ-asuraiś cāpi* 598.26; *so 'pi-r-atyantadharmavān* (text *°vāṃ*) 631.2.

4.63. Between parts of a compound: *hrī-r-apatrāpya*, q.v. in Dict., also s.v. *apatrāpya*; *aja-r-eḍake* MSV iv.228.16. Much more questionable is *anurāgataṃ* 'welcome', used repeatedly (Dict.) in Mv along with *svāgataṃ*, in both prose and verses. In some passages the mss., or some of them, read *anurāgaṃ*, and in some Senart prints the latter in his text, tho his note on i.35.6 (p. 400) appears to recognize *anurāgatam* as the true form. This is confirmed by the AMg. equivalent *aṇurāgayaṃ*, which is explained by an ancient comm. (cited by Pischel), as well as by Pischel 353, Sheth, and Ratnachandra, as = Skt. *anvāgatam* (*repha āgamikaḥ*, Ratnach.). Neither this Skt. word nor any normal MIndic descendant of it ever has any such meaning; if our word really goes back to it, the *r* is likely to be due to semantic confusion with *anurāga* 'affection'. It is still more likely, in my opinion, that *anurāgatam* and AMg. *aṇurāgayaṃ* are an alteration by popular etymology (influenced by association with *anurāga*)

of the word found in its original form in Pali *a-dur-āgataṃ* 'not un-welcome', which is used exactly like *anurāgatam* (CPD). Kern, IF 31.196, made the connection between the BHS and Pali words, but failed to note the AMg. form, which proves that the BHS is more than a mere corruption.

4.64. d as saṃdhi consonant. *yathā-d-iva* Mv i.15.15 (vs); so all mss., Senart em. *yatha-r-iva* (see § 4.61). In Mv iii.54.1 ff. (prose) occurs a whole series of such forms: *khu-d-ayaṃ, mṛdukā-d-ayaṃ, masinā-d-ayaṃ*, etc. The forms in final *ā* are n. sg. fem. — *na-d-upeti khedam* KP 37.6 (vs) 'does not become weary'.—In LV 133.5 (vs) text *sākiyasutā* (n. pl. m.) *abhiniṣkramanti*; but best ms. A °*sutā-d-abhi*°, which as lect. diff. is likely to be correct. In LV 340.13 (vs) *bāhuṃ prasārya yatha vidyud ivā nabhasthā-d-ābhāṣate* is probably to be read, 'stretching out his arm like lightning as it were in the sky, he spoke' etc. All mss. have *-d-*, tho Lefm. omits it. — *kṛtvā-d-aṅgulībhiḥ* Mmk 360.9 (vs); *kṛtvā-d-ubhau* Mmk 375.8 (vs).—In Ud xi.10 probably interpret *dviṣa* (= *dviṣan*)*-d-icchati*, rather than assume neuter *dviṣad* used as masc.; the Pali parallel (Dhp. 162) reads *icchati diso* (= Skt. *dviṣaḥ*).—In Karmav 158.3 (prose) occurs *adyādagre* 'from now on', = *adyāgre* in the next line; the usual form is *adyāgreṇa* (see Dict. s.v. *agreṇa*); in Pali we find *ajjatagge* and *ajjadagge*, derived by CPD from **ajjato agge*, which leaves the form with *-d-* unexplained, unless it be taken as a case of Prakritic voiced for voiceless consonant. Pali *ajja-d-agge* could contain 'Hiatus-bridging *d*' (so the Pali commentators take it, CPD) and our *adyādagre* might go back to an equivalent **adya-d-agre*, with *ā* by influence of the more usual *adyāgre(ṇa)*.

4.65. n as saṃdhi-consonant. Rare, and perhaps questionable. Since *n* appears to vary freely with *ṃ*, at least in orthography, perhaps the few seeming cases of hiatus-bridging *n* are connected with this confusion, which I consider orthographic. Note that in one case, *kiṃ imā-n-edṛśā parivrājakā* (mss. *pravrajyā*, perhaps to be kept) Mv iii.102.11 (prose), one ms. reads *imā-m-*. Otherwise I have noted *agṛhṇa devā-n-adhivāsanaṃ ca* LV 7.13 (vs), 'I accepted (the request of the gods), and the gods (accepted) my consent'; see § 8.85 for an alternative interpretation; *vasumatī-n-iya mahya sākṣī* LV 340.14 (vs) 'this earth is my witness'; here all mss. as in Lefm., except two which omit the syllable *ni* (Calc. °*matī-m-iya*°). The variant *āśu-n-eva* occurs (instead of *āśu-r-eva*) according to the mss. in Mv ii.19.19, see § 4.62. Senart on Mv iii.82.14; 402.8 assumes *upa-n-eti* = *upaiti* (*upa* plus *eti*), but I am not convinced. In 402.8 the true reading is probably *param upanamati*.

4.66. y as saṃdhi-consonant. Like Pali, BHS shows (in Mv only) a number of cases of *yeva* (see Dict.) for *eva*, usually after vowels, but in a few cases after final anusvāra. Probably this was originally a matter of saṃdhi, Geiger 66.1, but with extension of the use of the form. Some of the cases mentioned by Geiger l. c. are certainly of different origin; e. g. Pali *yiṭṭha* (= BHS *yaṣṭa*), where *y* is due to morphological analogy (strong-grade form of *yaj*).

4.67. h as saṃdhi-consonant? Cf. Geiger 67, 73.7; Pischel 338. So far as I know there is no case of this in our language. In SP 111.4 (vs) KN read *digvidiśāsu haṃce.* But WT read *añce*, and report *aññe* from their ms. K′; the Kashgar rec. has *aṇvate*, which may well be the true reading. Even if *haṃce* be accepted, the *h-* might, as WT point out, represent the particle *ha* (or, I would add, *iha*). There is no valid reason for assuming *-h-* as saṃdhi-consonant.

5. Number

5.1. The use of (historically) singular for plural forms, and vice versa, occurs on a large scale, in nouns and verbs alike. For the most part it seems to me a matter of morphological confusion. Therefore it has been treated under the various morphological categories where it occurs. Note the charge of confusion of singular and plural brought by learned monks against their brethren, reputedly in Buddha's lifetime, § 1.10.

5.2. Occasionally I have noted what seem to me plurals of respect. So *bhagavān* (sc. *Dīpaṃkara*) . . . *prakramensuḥ* (v.l. °*metsu*; Senart em. *prakramet*) Mv i.231.3 (prose); *eṣatā*, twice, RP 39.7, 2 pl. impv., addressed by gods to Bodhisattva Puṇyaraśmi; *yūyaṃ karetha* Mv iii.178.9 (prose), addressed by Anuruddha to his elder brother Mahānāma.

5.3. In Mv i.166.13 (vs) occurs a singular of a partitive genitive, instead of the normal plural (which occurs in a parallel phrase in the very next line, *śiloccayānāṃ yatha meruparvataḥ*): *tvam eva śreṣṭho sakalasya* (mss. *samathasya*) *prāṇino*, 'you alone are the best of every living being (= of all living beings)'.

5.4. A collective noun in the singular, or a sing. noun accompanied by an adjective denoting plurality, may be construed with a plural verb: *nārigaṇas* . . . *pratibodhayiṣu* LV 173.9 (vs); *māraḥ* . . . *saparivāro* . . . *utsṛjanti sma* LV 317.4–7 (prose).

5.5. Similarly there may be agreement between nouns and adjectives or participles of different numbers: *bahūni saṃdhāvacanehi coktaṃ* SP 59.4, 'and many things by means of comprehensive statements it has been said' (quasi-collective); *triṣu apāyi* (for *apāye*; also no doubt felt as collective) LV 92.15, 'in the three (triple) evil form(s) of existence'; so also *deve manuṣyeṣu ca triṣv apāye* Suv 59.7 (but *pañcasu kaṣāyakāle* LV 257.21 belongs in § 23.11, which see for LV 116.13–14 too); *nagaraṃ vyākulu bhītatrastamanaso* LV 193.10, 'the city was confused, (the people) with minds frightened and alarmed'; *sa śaṭhaḥ sasainyaḥ uttrasta bhinnahṛdayo prapalāna sarve* LV 319.13–14, 'the evil one with his host, frightened, heart-smitten, fleeing one and all' (cf. LV 317.4–7 in preceding paragraph).

Dual number

5.6. Duals are very extensively replaced by plurals. It is evident that the dual was not really alive in the underlying dialect, as it is not in MIndic generally. Even when a dual noun form is retained (or restored by secondary Sanskritization), plural adjectives or participles and verbs (less often singular verbs) may be used with it. See §§ 25. 1–3.

6. Gender

6.1. Gender in BHS is in about the same condition as in MIndic generally; and perhaps specially close to Apabhraṃśa, in which Hemacandra 4.445 flatly declares that 'gender has no rule' (*liṅgam atantram*). Cf. Jacobi Bhav. p. 31* (§ 22); in this text the distinction between masc. and nt. *a*-stems ('die allein in Betracht kommen') is 'soweit verwischt' that Jacobi makes no attempt to distinguish them in his Glossary, marking only the feminines with 'f'. He notes further that nouns with nt. forms are used with attributes that are definitely fem. in form; 'but the commonest case is that fem. stems assume masc. endings (seldom the reverse)'. Even in Pali examples of all these things are not rare, as Geiger 76 clearly states. Note that confusion as to gender was charged against monks, reputedly in Buddha's lifetime, by their more learned brethren, § 1.10.

6.2. To be sure, the question may be raised (and has been raised by Pischel 359) whether Hemacandra's dictum is not something of an overstatement, even for Ap. Actually Jacobi, in a later statement (San. § 13), seems a bit more conservative than in his edition of Bhav. I have felt it desirable to retain the traditional classification of nouns by the three Skt. genders, which is after all justified by the great majority of BHS forms. At the same time I wish to emphasize that the confusion of gender in BHS is very far reaching and widespread: more so than has been commonly recognized, I think. I suspect that in MIndic generally it has also been rather understated than overstated.

6.3. This confusion manifests itself in two ways (as in MIndic, cf. the references cited above). First, endings appropriate to one gender are transferred to a noun belonging to another. Second, pronominal or adjectival attributes with endings appropriate to one gender are used in agreement with nouns belonging to another. Often, of course, both types occur together.

6.4. I must refer here to an opinion held by the late lamented Heinrich Lüders (Philologica Indica 279 ff.; originally from SBBA 1913.988–1028), and accepted by Dschi, NAWGött. 1949, 272 ff., that in 'old Ardhamāgadhī' (also, Lüders thought, in Pali and later Pkts.) the acc. pl. m. of vocalic stems (and perhaps fem., Lüders 285 f.; more definitely Dschi l. c.) ended in '*-ni* with lengthening of the final stem-vowel', i. e. in *-āni*, *-īni*, *-ūni*, while the corresponding nom. pl. lacked this *-ni*. Both these scholars admit, however, that the n. pl. of m. nouns also occurs ('by extension', they think) in *-āni*, in Aśokan and later. To me the whole theory seems unacceptable even for Aśokan, and certainly for BHS. The endings in question are simply neuter plurals, due to the confusion of endings here treated. No significant difference in this respect is perceptible between nom. and acc.; if the acc. forms in *-ni* are commoner than the nom., this cannot be fundamentally important. At most, perhaps neuter forms may have been more favored in object than in subject position. No other origin than the Skt. nt. ending is conceivable for this *-ni* after *ā*, *ī*, *ū*, in the plural. The confusion of gender-forms is, moreover, not limited to the plural; it is found also in the sg. It is also not limited to stems ending in vowels. It applies to all nouns and their adjectival and pronominal epithets, sg. and pl. Indeed, it is not even limited to the nom. and acc.; it occurs in other cases also; but in them masc. and nt. are indistinguishable in Skt., so that confusion can be noted only between them and the fem. Such forms as *yāvanti*, *catvāri*, *idaṃ*, and adjectives in *-aṃ*, all agreeing with n. (pl. or) sg. m. nouns, cannot be accounted for by the Lüders-Dschi theory. Moreover, these scholars ignore the use of masc. forms instead of fem. and nt., and fem. instead of masc. and nt., all equally familiar. The difficulty for Lüders was caused by his assumption that 'change of gender' in the noun would have to be assumed, in default of his theory. It is not a case of 'change of gender', but of incipient breakdown of formal distinctions of gender.

Endings of one gender transferred to nouns of another

6.5. The first of the two types of confusion mentioned above will be perhaps sufficiently, tho certainly not exhaustively, illustrated under Noun Inflection. Some cases, where it seems that 'change of gender' in the commonly accepted sense (as frequently in Sanskrit) may reasonably be assumed, are noted in the Dict. (It must be admitted that here the line cannot be strictly drawn between transfer of nouns to a different gender and transfer of endings from one gender to another.) Certain or likely cases of transfer to one gender of endings originally appropriate to another will be found as follows.

6.6. In nouns of the *a*-declension (m. and nt.): *-ā* as n. sg. m. and (also *-āṃ*) as acc. sg. m., at least possibly borrowed from fem. *ā*-stems; *-aṃ* as n. sg. m. (from nt., or from acc. m.? probably both); instr. sg. *-ayā*, *-āya* (f.); dat. *-āye* (f.); n. and acc. pl. m. *-āni* (nt.); n. and acc. pl. nt. *-ā* (also *-a*), best regarded as from m.; n. and acc. pl. nt. *-āṃ* (= *-ān*), from m. acc. pl. See §§ 8.24, 26, 38, 42, 45, 86, 98, 100, 101, 102.

6.7. In (fem.) *ā*-stems: n. sg. *-u* (for *-o* = *-as* or *-aṃ*, m. or nt.); inst. *-ena*; abl. *-āt*; gen. *-asya* (in pronouns); loc. *-e*; n. pl. *-e* (in pronouns); acc. pl. *-e* (MIndic m.) and *-ān*, *-āṃ* (m.); n. and acc. pl. *-āni* (nt.); voc. pl. *-āho* (MIndic m.); inst. *-ais*, *-ebhiḥ*, *-ehi*. See §§ 9.13, 69, 71, 75–77, 94–96, 98–100, 103–105.

6.8. In *i*-stems: n. sg. m. and f. *-iṃ*, *-im*, § 10.23 (may be partly borrowed from MIndic nt., as well as from Skt. acc. m. and f.); oblique (f.) *-īya*, *-iya*, *-īye*, *-iye*, *-īyo*, used with m. nouns, § 10.89; n.-acc. pl. *-inas*, as f. (§ 10.155); *-īni* (nt.) as m. and f. § 10.160; *-yas* (f.) as m. § 10.162; *īn* *-īṃ* (m. acc. pl.) as f. § 10.165; *-īs* (f. acc. pl.) as nom. m. (as well as f., § 10.167); *-iyas*, *-iyo*, *īyas*, *-īyo* (f.), as n. and acc. pl. m. §§ 10.168–172.

6.9. In *u*-stems: *-ūni* (nt.) as n.-acc. pl. m. and f., § 12.53.

6.10. I shall add here a few striking cases which do not make on me the sort of impression made by what are commonly called cases of 'change of gender' in Sanskrit. Some of them also illustrate the second type of confusion: *praṇidhi*, masc. in Skt. (to be sure not used there in its Buddhist sense), has also, and commonly, fem. forms and modifiers (LV 167.15; 175.13; 283.2; 364.10; 415.21; Mv i.54.6, etc.), but sometimes nom. sg. in *iṃ*, § 10.23, which may be regarded as nt.; *maraṇāya* (v.l. °*ṇāye*) *pāraṃ* Mv i.165.8 'to the farther shore of death', as if to **maraṇā*, fem.; cf. LV 175.11 *maraṇo*, masc. (but supported only by the best ms. A; Śikṣ 206.9 cites the line with *maraṇaṃ* as in the other mss.); *ratna* has masc. forms, *vividhāṃś ca ratnān* SP 364.5 (ed. em. °*dhā ca ratnā*); *ratanās* (all mss., ed. em. °*nā*) *trayaḥ* LV 421.2; *utpannā ratanās* (all mss.,

ed. em. °*nā*) *trīṇi loke paramadurlabhāḥ* (all mss., ed. em. °*bhā*) LV 421.6; *mudrā*, recorded only as fem. in Skt., Pali, and Pkt., is often masc. or nt. in Mmk, as 422.8; 423.7; 424.9; 472.8 f. etc. (Dict.), tho still oftener fem.; sometimes forms of different genders occur in close proximity, as *padmamudreṇa* 424.18, *padmamudrayā* 20; *antrāyāṃ* 'in the intestines' Divy 409.15 (Skt. *antra* and Pali *anta* recorded only as nt.).

Attributes formally of one gender agreeing with nouns of another

6.11. The second type, already illustrated in some of the preceding cases, may be exemplified further. It seems that numerals (notably the words for 'three' and 'four') are especially apt to show this confusion. In not a few of the following cases, it is impossible to draw any sharp line between forms listed here and those listed in the morphological categories referred to in §§ 6.6–9.

6.12. Masc. modifier with nt. noun: *trayaś ca yānāny* SP 33.4 (Kashgar rec.; ed. with Nep. mss. *trīṇi*); *anuvyañjanā ye ca . . . aśītipūrṇāḥ pravarā viśiṣṭāḥ* SP 62.3; *tān api . . . vividhāni śabdāni* SP 358.14 (*śabda*, tho masc. regularly, and even in lines 8 and 12 above on this page, sometimes has nt. endings in BHS); *śarīra vaistārika . . . susatkṛto* (all noms.) SP 69.2; *jyotiṣāṇī patantaḥ* (so all mss.) LV 195.13; read *maṅgalā* (nom. pl. nt.) *ye* LV 214.12 for ed. *maṅgalāyai* (senseless); *tapo . . . pratapto* LV 336.17; *abhibhavate ruta* (acc. pl. nt.) *sarvi bhāṣamānāṃ* (= °*nān*) LV 366.19; *nakṣatrāṇi . . . ye* (nom. pl.) LV 390.14; *satyāni caturo* Mv i.188.5; *eko akṣī* (so mss., Senart em. *akṣi*; prose) Mv iii.376.1; *viśeṣayuktāṃś ca ratnāni* Divy 397.23 (prose); *ubhau jānumaṇḍale* Av i.2.11 etc., see Speyer's note (Pali *ubho* used for all genders); but contrariwise, *antu* (=*antau*, dual masc.) *ubhe* (nt.!) . . . *eti* (= *ete*, dual nt.) Samādh 19.32; *imi praṇidhānā* (nom. pl.; regularly nt.) . . . *sarvi . . . samagrāḥ* Bhad 58.

6.13. In LV 438.17 (prose), (*maheśvara . . .*) *-pramukhā aṣṭādaśa śuddhāvāsakāyikā devaputra-sahasrāṇi*, the masc. adjectives are construed 'ad sensum' with 'gods', **devaputrāḥ*, not mechanically with °*sahasrāṇi*. Weller 32 (on 285.20) wrongly takes the epithet ending °*kāyikā* as compounded with the following *devaputra*°; he is refuted sufficiently by the parallel adjective ending °*pramukhā*, which cannot be compounded with the following word. In 285.20, also, °*kāyikā* should be separated from *deva*° and interpreted in the same way.

6.14. Neuter modifier with masculine noun: *yāvanti . . . sattvāḥ* SP 9.5; *catvāri ca lokapālāḥ* SP 55.3; *catvāri dharmā imi evarūpā* SP 292.15; *māsān pi catvāri* SP 373.4; *sarve mahānagnabalair upetā vistīrṇahastī navaratnavanti* LV 28.5; *dṛṣṭaṃ* (nom. sg.) *kumāra . . . niṣkramanto* LV 135.5 (all mss. *dṛṣṭaṃ* except one, unmetrically, *dṛṣṭa*); *catvāri lokapālāḥ* LV 185.7; *ogha catvāri* LV 195.18; *sarve chinnā teṣu trīṇy apy apāyāḥ* LV 196.8; *no ca kiṃcid api deśu vidyate* LV 237.4 'and there was no place found'; *mahāsāla iva mūlachinnaṃ* (all mss.) LV 334.10; *rāgamadanamakaraṃ tṛṣṇormijalaṃ kudṛṣṭisaṃgrāhaṃ* (all adjectives with next) *saṃsārasāgara* (nom. sg. masc.; separate from next word) *mahaṃ* (= *mahān*) *saṃtīrṇo* (note masc. ending!) LV 374.17–18; *idaṃ dharmaṃ* (acc. sg.) LV 396.1 (prose); *kṛcchreṇa me 'yaṃ* (sc. *dharmaḥ*) *saṃprāptaṃ alaṃ . . .* LV 397.19 (but v.l. *saṃprāptam alaṃ*, perhaps read so, understanding *saṃprāpta* plus 'hiatus-bridging' *m*? metrically indifferent); *ayaṃ ghoṣo mayā śrutaṃ* Mv i.28.15; 29.2, 5 (in 2 Senart reads *śruto*, with 2 mss. out of 6); *sarvaṃ* (2 mss. *sarva-*) *saṃsāro* Mv i.77.14 (prose); *ayaṃ lokaḥ . . . sarvaśūnyaṃ* (all mss.) *bhaviṣyati* Mv i.126.7–8 (prose); *so imāṃ* (= *imān*) *catvāri mahādvīpāṃ* (= °*pān*; there follow other acc. pl. masc. adjectives) Mv i.193.18–19, and same phrase ii.158.18 (prose); *catvāri lokapatino* Mv i.204.12 = ii.8.7; *putrā . . . trīṇi paṇḍitāḥ* Mv i.274.8; *catvāri putrāḥ* Mv i.352.13; *yāvanti śabdās* Samādh 8.25.

6.15. Masc. modifer with fem. noun: *parṣāś ca catvāra(ḥ)* SP 9.1; *prabhāsayaṃ* (= °*yan*, pres. pple. nom. sg. masc.) SP 24.2 (agreeing with *sā raśmir* in preceding line); *vedanā* (regularly fem., exceptionally nt.) *vītivṛttā ime* (masc.) LV 214.6; (*apsarāḥ*, line 21) *te dadantikāḥ* LV 236.22; other cases of *te* with fem. nouns, LV 240.18; 328.19; similarly *ye* LV 193.14; 328.19; *ṛddhi vipulo* LV 194.6 (printed as a cpd. by Lefm., but must be two words, 'the abundant prosperity'); *Sujāta* (m.c. for °*tā*) *matimāṃ* (= °*mān*) LV 271.21 'the wise Sujātā' (so also Calc., with gloss *matimatī*); *caturo diśaḥ* (acc. pl.) LV 282.9; *sarve prabhā* (nom. pl.) LV 291.2; *gāthā imi* (= *ime*) LV 355.18; *trayo koṭiyo* Mv i.61.13; *trayo pakṣiyo* (fem.) *niryāntāyo* Mv i.272.8; *catvāro dhātrīyo* Mv ii.423.6 (prose); *sarve* (of women) Mv ii.425.7; *te devatā* Mv iii.304.3; *kanyāḥ . . . catvāro* Suv 106.2; *pūrayi tāṃ kriya sarvi aśeṣāṃ* Bhad. 44 (three formally masc. epithets of *kriya* = *kriyāḥ*; even if a nt. stem *kriya* be admitted, like *kiriya* reported for Pali, masc. would not fit).

6.16. Neuter modifier with fem. noun: *parṣāś ca catvāri* SP 294.11; 393.4; *kecit tu catvāri* (sc. *jātīḥ*, 'births') *atikramitvā* SP 330.7; *idam avaci giram* LV 329.21 'spake this word'; *divyāni saṃpatti* (Senart em. °*tī*) Mv i.31.11 (prose; acc. pl.; cf. 32.9 *divyāṃ saṃpattiṃ*, acc. sg.); *te dāni devadevatāṃ* (!) *namasyanti svakasvakāni* Mv i.245.7 (prose); *divyāni ca saṃgīti* (nom. pl.) Mv ii.160.19 (prose); *catvāri devatā* Mv ii.232.17; *trīṇi vā jātiṃ catvāriṃ vā jātiṃ* (so mss.) Mv ii.284.8–9; *catvāri nītayo* Mv ii.404.19; *puṣkariṇiyo ca nānāprakārāṇi acchāni* etc. (series of adjectives, all nt. in endings) Mv iii.288.7 ff.; *catvāri dhātrīye* (or °*iye*, mss.; Senart em. °*īyo*) Mv iii.405.6; *catvāri koṭi pramadānāṃ* RP 23.17; *svakasvakāni strīyo* (nom.) Mv iii.69.9; *vāpīyo ca puṣkariṇiyo ca sukhasalilāni* (and other adj. in *-āni*; nom.) 69.14; *sarvāṇi cāṣṭādaśa śreṇī* (nom.) 161.14.

6.17. Masculine and/or neuter modifiers with fem. nouns (i. e. ambiguous forms, or both in the same passage): *catvār'* (could be = °*ra(ḥ)* or °*ri*) *imā parṣā* SP 15.11 (vs); 16.8 (vs); *caturṇa parṣāṇā* SP 237.13; 294.6 (and according to both edd. 295.8, but here the mss. point rather to *catasṛṇa*, fem.); *mahyaṃ bhāṣato* LV 78.4 'of me speaking' (Māyā speaks); *yāvanti kecil lipi* (nom. pl. fem.) LV 146.5; *caturṇāṃ pariṣadāṃ* Mv i.8.11 and *caturṇāṃ parṣāṇāṃ* i.27.11 (both prose); *paśyati anekāṃ* (= °*kān*, masc.) *brāhmaṇānāṃ sahasriyo* (to *sahasrī*, fem.) *samāgatāni* (nt.) Mv i.310.1 (prose); *teṣāṃ ceṭīnām* Mv ii.172.10; 173.6; *te*, nom. pl. (referring to these *ceṭīs*) Mv ii.172.11; cf. *ceṭīni* 15; *tehi ceṭīhi* Mv ii.173.8; *yāvanti senā . . . sarve* (sc. *senāḥ*) Mv ii.341.8–9; *teṣāṃ* (women) Mv iii.265.18; *tasmān nagarīto* Divy 222.6–7 (prose); *tasmād ṛddhitaḥ* Divy 223.28 (prose); *pratyavasṛteṣu bhikṣubhikṣuṇīṣu* Divy 235.27–28 ('ad sensum', common gender?); *Vāsavadattayā lobhākṛṣṭena* Divy 353.18 (prose).

6.18. The instr. masc.-nt. *mahatā* is very commonly used in Mv, and occasionally elsewhere, with the instr. of nouns like *ṛddhi*, *vibhūṣā*, and synonyms. This seems to have been a widespread usage, for it occurs in Prakrit, at least AMg. Cf. Pischel 396, AMg. *mahayā iddhīe* etc.; Jacobi, Ausgew. Erz. 33.26 (AMg.) *mahayā vibhūīe* (wrongly printed as cpd. by Jacobi). Examples: *mahatā rājarddhyā* LV 119.20 (prose); *mahatā rājarddhīye* (sometimes °*iye*) Mv i.216.18; 227.10; 258.19; 259.11; ii.180.7 etc.; *mahatā samṛddhīye* Mv ii.75.6; 100.6, 10; 111.8; *mahatā vibhūṣāye mahatā samṛddhīye* Mv ii.111.12; *ma*° *rājarddhīye ma*° *viyūhāye ma*° *samvṛddhiye ma*° *vibhūṣāye* Mv ii.156.17, etc.

6.19. Fem. modifier with masc. noun: *pālāś catasro* LV 233.14 'the four (*loka-*)*pālas*'; *dakṣiṇasyāṃ diśo bhāge* LV 389.6 (the only v.l. is *dakṣiṇasyā*; Lefm. em.

dakṣiṇesmin). One might suggest influence from the fem. gender of *diś*. But 389.10 *dakṣiṇesmin diśo bhāge* (Lefm., but many mss. °*ṇasyāṃ* or °*ṇasyā*); *pūrvasmin* (*d*° *bh*°) 388.8; *paścimesmin* (3 mss. °*masyāṃ*) 390.4; *uttaresmin* 391.2. Probably the reading of the mss. is to be kept. — *catasro mallakā* (mss. *mallā*) Mv i.65.15 (in next line *balavantaḥ* agreeing with the same masc. noun).

6.20. Fem. modifier with nt. noun: *catasraḥ caturaśītikoṭivarṣasahasrāṇi* Mv i.59.4 (prose). Uncertain is *anuttarāṃ jñāna* (m.c. for *jñānaṃ*) *gaveṣamāṇāḥ* SP 10.5, without v.l. in KN; but WT *anuttaraṃ* with their ms. K′. In MSV ii.88.18 f. (prose) occurs (*sādhu*) *bhikṣavaḥ śraddhādeyasya* (see this in Dict.) *mātrā-paribhojitāyāḥ kālapari*°, then three other cpds. in *pari*°, which, it seems, can hardly be called anything but a gen. sg. f. of a ppp. agreeing with a nt. noun, 'a gift-of-faith enjoyed with moderation' etc.; there is nothing more in the sentence; no simple em. occurs to me, and the form is recorded five times.

7. Case

7.1. On the whole, the functions of the cases of nouns and pronouns are not markedly different from Skt., except for a certain amount of morphological confusion which is treated in the morphology: for example, the use of common oblique-case forms of fem. long-vowel stems; and the absorption by the genitive of the functions of the dative, resulting, as a reflex, in the use of old dative forms in gen. functions, particularly in the pronouns (both as in MIndic).

7.2. Here will be noted examples of some uses of the cases which, tho not always unknown in Skt., are at least not usual in the regular classical language.

7.3. Often no clear distinction can be made between morphological and syntactic confusion. There is no doubt of the existence of both, and frequently it seems to make little difference whether we say e. g. 'this ablative form is used as an instrumental', or 'this instrumental construction is replaced by an ablative.' Especially in the pronouns there is no doubt of extensive morphological confusion between the case-forms.

Syntactic agreement between different case-forms

7.4. Sometimes there is syntactic agreement between different case-forms in one and the same passage, usually (probably always) when both cases may be used in the same sense.

7.5. So, acc. and instr.: *kalpāna koṭyo bahubhīr acintyair* SP 385.3 (vs), 'thru many, inconceivable crores of kalpas'. Most mss. read *koṭī*, but either this or *koṭyo* can only be acc. pl.; the following instr. adjectives agree with it. Both cases are used to express extent of time.

7.6. Acc. and loc. (others § 7.18): *diśo* (acc. pl.) *daśāsu* (m.c. for *daśasu*) LV 314.8; and *daśasū diśato* (apparently acc. pl.) LV 167.11; see § 9.97.

7.7. Instr. and gen.: (after comparative) *mama* ... *kāruṇikayā* Divy 13.1, see § 7.35.

7.8. Instr. and loc.: *tasminn eva kṣaṇalavamuhūrtena* SP 8.3 (prose), 'at that very instant, moment, and hour'. Either case could be used. No v.l. in KN. But WT report their ms. K′ as reading *muhūrte*, and adopt this reading. — *na ca cyavāmī itu gṛdhrakūṭāt, anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiś ca* SP 324.12 (vs), so both edd.; the only v.l. is one of KN's mss. °*koṭiṣū*. Perhaps this should be classed below under § 7.32, *-koṭibhiś* being describable simply as an instr. form used as loc.

7.9. Dat. and gen.: *dharmeśvarāya* ... *dharma bhāsato* (v.l. *bhāṣ-*) LV 171.14 (vs), 'to the Lord of Dharma as he is preaching the Dharma'. Possibly, also, *lokanāthasya tāyine* (text *tāpine*) Mmk 599.20; 600.17; but same phrase with °*naḥ* 499.19; perhaps °*no* is intended in this (very corrupt) text.

7.10. Gen. and loc. (wholly or chiefly 'absolute' expressions): *mahya* (vv. ll. *mahyaṃ, mama*) *parinirvṛte* SP 237.1 (vs), 'when I have entered nirvāṇa'; *mayi nirvṛte* (v.l. *mama nirvṛtasya*) SP 252.3, and *nirvṛte naranāyake* SP 256.4, both undoubtedly attempts to correct the original reading preserved in the Kashgar rec., JRAS 1911.1071 and 1074, respectively *mama nirvṛtasmi*, and *nirvṛtasya vināyake*; *sugatasya nirvṛte* SP 392.9 (one ms. *sugatesmi*, obviously a secondary correction, adopted WT); *mama* ... *āyūhatyāṃ niryūhatyāṃ* (loc. sg. fem pres. pples.) Gv 199.24 (2d ed. °*tyāḥ*, twice; by em.?).

7.11. In Laṅk 9.11 ff. occur first three loc. forms, *samanantarapratīvibuddhe parāvṛttāśraye* (so read, text °*vṛtā*°) *svacittadṛśyamātrādhigame*, then gen. *(a)vikalpapracārasthitasya*, all of which agree with the next following noun, printed *laṅkādhipate*, for which we must certainly read °*pateḥ*, gen.; after it follows a long series of other gens. in agreement with the same noun, ending in 10.2, where follows the verb *aśrauṣīt* (of which the intended subject can only be *Laṅkādhipati*!).

7.12. In Mv iii.94.3 (vs) *cārikāṃ pratipannasya śikhisya lokanāyake*, 'when the World-guide Śikhin had begun his pilgrimage', is gen.-loc. absolute. The words *śikhisya lokanāyake* are repeated many times in the passage 94.2–97.7, usually in similar absolute construction. In a few cases (94.15, 17; 96.22) only a possessive gen. seems interpretable, tho the loc. *lokanāyake* still remains in agreement. On the other hand, in 97.1 *carante* (loc.) replaces *śikhisya*, before *lokanāyake*. In a similar group of verses 98.12 ff., the phrase *carante lokanāyake* (as in 97.1) recurs many times; it is clearly absolute, at least in most occurrences; and in many, beginning 98.17, it is preceded by *cārikāṃ pratipannasya*, this gen. being in agreement with the loc.

Nominative

7.13. 'Nominative absolute' or nominativus pendens. (Treated for the Brāhmaṇa language by Hanns Oertel, Syntax of Cases, 1. The Disjunct Use of Cases, Heidelberg, 1926.) This occurs rather frequently:

priyajanaparivārāś ca māram utsṛjya dīnamukhā ekānte gatvā pradhyāyantam apaśyat, LV 301.17 'his friends and attendants abandoning Māra, and going to one side with downcast faces—he saw them (sc. *priyajanam*, or *parivāram*) in pensive meditation.'

tato sudhanu kumāro pitareṇa subāhunā bandhanāgāre bandhitvā ahaṃ visarjitā Mv ii.111.2 'then Prince Sudhanu —by his father Subāhu, imprisoning (Sudhanu) in prison, I was dismissed.'

samanantaravyākṛto punar jyotipālo bhikṣur ... iyaṃ mahāpṛthivī ... kampe Mv i.336.11, 'immediately the monk Jyotipāla (was) prophesied ... this earth trembled.'

sa khalv ahaṃ ... āhāraṃ āharanto ayaṃ me kāyo ... abhūṣi Mv ii.126.16, 'I now, taking nourishment, this my body became ...'

na sattvaḥ ... yaḥ samartho 'calāyā ... sahadarśanena kleśā na vyupaśamaṃ gaccheyuḥ Gv 173.11–13, 'there is no creature who would be able, immediately on seeing Acalā, his impurities would not become stilled.'

atha ... sudhanaḥ ... yena ... sthāvarā ... tenopasaṃkrāmato daśapṛthivīdevatāśatasahasrāṇy ... vācam udīrayām āsuḥ Gv 220.26 f., 'then Sudhana, as he was going to where Sthāvarā was, the 1,000,000 earth goddesses said.'

idānīṃ tvam evāgamya cakṣuḥ pratilabdham Divy 17.18 'now your very self, having come—sight has been got back (by us).'

kṛtsnā me rajanī jātā (ed. em. *yātā*) *mṛtyum evānucin-*

tayan, Divy 422.6 (vs) 'the whole night passed for me, (as I was) meditating (nom. sg.) on death alone.'

sa Buddha ity aśrutapūrvaṃ śabdaṃ śrutvā sarvaromakūpāny āhṛṣṭāni Divy 35.4–5 'he, hearing the word Buddha, never heard before, all (his) hairs stood on end.'

7.14. Nominative for instrumental. We may group by themselves some instances of the logical subject in the nom., followed by a passive construction which would require the instrumental:

In LV 186.7, read: *na khalv apy ayaṃ* (so mss.) *kumāro* (or °*raḥ*, so best mss., incl. 'l' of Weller 28) *kadācid udyānabhūmim abhinirgantavyam*, 'not, to be sure, this prince (nom.), is it ever to be gone forth (by him) to the park-ground.'

bhagavān dīpaṃkaro meghasya . . . anuttarāye samyaksaṃbodhaye vyākṛtaṃ Mv i.239.4–6 (Senart em. *vyākārṣīt*), 'the Lord Dīpaṃkara . . . (by him) for Megha prediction was made unto supreme complete enlightenment.'

so kāṇḍo tasya rājño pādamūle sthitvā pādaphalakaṃ khaṇḍakhaṇḍīkṛtam Mv ii.82.15, 'this arrow, stopping at the feet of the king, (by it) the footstool was smashed to pieces.'

so dāni rājā . . . paribhogānī ca dinnā (sc. *rājñā*) Mv ii.443.16–18. And so 443.20–444.2 *so dāni rājā . . . dhītā . . . bhāryā dinnā*.

te dāni udyānapālā . . . āmravanaṃ alaṃkṛtaṃ (sc. *udyānapālaiḥ*) Mv ii.451.10–11.

tāni (sc. *māṃsāni*) *ca . . . aurabhrikā, bhakṣyāṇīti kṛtvā, mūlyahetor vikrīyante*, Laṅk 246.7–8, 'and these (unclean meats; nom. or acc. nt.), butchers (nom.), representing them as fit to eat, they are sold for money.'

7.15. Nominative for ablative. Instead of the abl. of comparison after *anyatra* 'except', a nom. is sometimes substituted (as if subject of a syntactically independent statement):

āhārasaṃjñā ca na tatra bheṣyati, anyatra dharme rati dhyānaprītiḥ, SP 206.1 (vs), 'and no trace of food will be there, except (that the food consisting of) delight in dharma and love of contemplation (will be there).'

anyatra bhūri (v.l. *sūri*, read so) *bodhisattva* (nom.) *brahmakalpasaṃnibhe* (nom.) LV 74.4 (vs), 'except it be the Bodhisattva . . .'

Accusative

7.16. The accusative with nouns and adjectives treated as verbal in force. Cf. Sen 12–13; many of his examples, particularly those depending on forms in *-anāya*, I regard as infinitives (§ 36.15). It will be noted that sometimes the governing noun is the prior member of a compound. In LV 68.8–9, read *sattvān pratisaṃmodanakuśalo* (cf. Weller 22), 'capable of greeting creatures'; *dharmam eva gocarī* LV 76.4 'devoted to Dharma alone'; *sarvasattvān dharmadānena saṃtarpaṇārthaṃ* LV 275.12 'to gratify all creatures by the gift of dharma'; *pūjanā* (inf., see §§ 36.18) *hitakaraṃ* LV 282.8; *śakyā kartuṃ candrādityau tamatimira vitimirakarau nabho 'dya mahītalaṃ* LV 337.14, 'it might be possible to make obscure with darkness the moon and sun, which today make free from darkness sky and earth' (Tib. seems to have had a different Skt. text and is followed by Foucaux in translating the Skt.).

7.17. Blend constructions resulting in two accusatives with verbs: *anujānāti* (usually governs either dat. or gen. of person and acc. of thing, or acc. of person and dat.-gen. or infin. of thing), Mv i.132.14 (vs) *deśikaṃ saha caurebhyaḥ anujānāmi jīvitam*, 'to the guide with the thieves (apparently dat.-abl. ending for instr., but see § 7.46) I grant life' ('the guide . . . I permit to live'); *avakirati*, usually construed with acc. and instr., 'bestrew (something) with (something),' takes two accs. in LV 317.17–18, *muktasukusumāni ca mahīm avakiranto*, 'strewing loose flowers upon the earth.'

7.18. Accusative in precise dating. The acc. of time is often used (not only of 'extent' but) where we should expect the loc., in precise dating. To be sure the like is not unknown in Vedic and Skt. (Speyer, VSS § 28). So *kalpāna śatasahasraṃ* Mv i.35.13 (prose), '100,000 kalpas ago'; *bhaveyaṃ anāgatam adhvānaṃ tathāgato* Mv i.238.14; 330.1; 'may I in (some) future time become a T.'; with parallel loc. *anāgatam adhvānaṃ aparimite asaṃkhyeye kalpe* Mv i.239.6; *atītam adhvānaṃ* Mv i.286.22; 288.13; seeming blend, *atītam adhvāne* (perhaps to be interpreted as *atīta-m-*, with 'hiatus-bridging' *m*) Mv ii.48.16 (so mss.); 64.14 (so text with one ms., v.l. °*te-m-adhvāne*); 67.19 and 69.11 (both without v.l.); *nāsti mama adya rātrīṃ kṣaṇo* Mv iii.37.6 'tonight I have no time (liberty)'; *yaṃ* (or *yat*) *kālaṃ* 'what time' = 'when', quasi-conjunction, common, Mv ii.210.14; iii.144.13, 15; 145.7; 272.9; *yatra kālaṃ* = prec., Mv iii.295.13, 15, 16; *yāṃ velāṃ* = prec., Mv i.362.11; in Mv more commonly *yaṃ velaṃ* (MIndic), e. g. i.361.3; 362.2, 17, 20; ii.172.15; 173.18; 210.17; 211.4, 12; 242.13; iii.76.1; 145.5; 163.4; 291.8, 20 (with correlative *taṃ velaṃ* in 292.1); note *yaṃ velaṃ . . . taṃ velaṃ* iii.287.11, resumed in 13 with *yatra kāle . . . tatra kāle*; also *yatra* (*ca*) *velāṃ* ii.65.14.

7.19. The accusative of measure: not unknown in Skt., tho called 'rare' by Speyer VSS § 27. It is fairly common here; the few examples given by Sen p. 10 could be greatly extended. Those interested will find some others in my Dict. s.vv. *āvedha* and *udvedha*; e. g. (*yaṣṭi* . . .) *dvādaśayojanāni udvedhena*, (a stick) 'twelve leagues in height'.

7.20. Miscellaneous accusatives, for more usual loc., dat., or other cases.

7.21. Partiples of root *budh* with the goal in acc.: *buddhe ca bodhiṃ naranāyake 'smin* SP 190.4, 'upon this Lord of Men, enlightened into enlightenment' (such cases are less unusual with finite forms, cf. Sen 6 under 'cognate acc.'); *cira budhyamānena anuttaraṃ padam* SP 190.6, 'for a long time becoming enlightened into the highest place (= enlightenment, or nirvāṇa).'

7.22. Other 'cognate' or 'inner' accs.: *aham eva tubhya gati gacchayamī* (= *tava gatiṃ gacchāmi*) LV 223.1, 'I am going your course (i. e. where you go)'; *vīryabalaṃ parākramā* LV 178.18, 'display the force of heroic energy'; *āsāṃ* (= *āśāṃ*) *vrataṃ sidhyatāṃ* LV 221.21, 'let (your) vow succeed (according) to (your) desire!'

7.23. For expected loc.: *aparamātaraṃ prasakto* Mv i.244.7–8, 'devoted to his "second mother"'; *sthitā catasro . . . caturdiśaṃ* Mv ii.56.17, 'four maids stationed in (each of) the four directions'; *purimāṃ diśaṃ tiṣṭhasi devate tvaṃ* id. 19, 'thou standest, goddess, in the eastern quarter'; *caraṇau* (? so probably read with several mss.; Lefm. *caraṇo*; only Calc. *caraṇe*) *nipatya* LV 416.4, 'falling at his feet'; *svabhavanāni śmaśānasaṃjñām utpādayām āsuḥ* LV 278.7, 'conceived their own (divine) dwellings to be (like) graveyards' (the normal construction with *saṃjñām utpādayati* 'form a notion, conceive a thing' is loc., as e. g. SP 319.8 *na ca tathāgate durlabhasaṃjñām utpādayeyuḥ*; here I believe the analogy of root *man*, which takes two accus., has operated, cf. LV 280.20, the verse equivalent to 278.7, *vimānāni śmaśānānīva menire*).

7.24. For expected abl.: *aṣṭamāṃ bhūmiṃ prabhṛti* 'from the 8th stage' Mv i.105.11, 13 (prose), 15 (vs; here read with mss. *prabhṛtiṃ*, m.c., Senart em. °*ti*). Noted by Sen 14.

7.25. A curious apparent use of adverbial acc.: *ayaṃ ca . . . lokadhātuḥ ṣaḍvikāram aṣṭādaśamahānimittam abhūt* LV 410.21–22 (prose), 'this world became in sixfold fashion eighteen-great-omen-wise' (there follows the stock list of *akampat prākampat* etc., six groups of three verbs each).

7.26. Asyndetic acc. (sentence not completed): *kiṃ puno adya māṃ hīnasaṃsevatas tṛpti gacched ahaṃ* LV 215.18 (vs), 'how much less today to me, from cultivation of the low,—could I go to satisfaction?' Since *ahaṃ* cannot be construed otherwise, *tṛpti* must be acc. with *gacched* (used as 1 sg.). Cf. BhG. 11.26, with my note, HOS 38.186.

Instrumental-accusative adverbial phrases

7.27. Like Pali, BHS has a common adverbial phrase *kālena kālaṃ*, which means (again as in Pali) both (1) 'from time to time', SP 276.7, 10; Av i.241.9; and (2) 'continuously', LV 100.13; Divy 62.10; 71.5; 298.25; probably Kv 28.14. Sometimes it is not clear which meaning was intended: SP 225.5; Mv iii.154.14; Divy 10.27; Suv 94.3.

7.28. A few other similar expressions occur: *utsaṅgenotsaṅgam* LV 76.20 'by myriads' (*utsaṅga*); *vṛkṣeṇa vṛkṣaṃ paryaṭantī* LV 82.15 'wandering from tree to tree', lit. 'tree-by-tree' (followed by *vanād vanaṃ caṅkramyamāṇā*, cf. § 7.29, 'from forest to forest', abl.-acc.); *grāmeṇa grāmam anucaṅkramantaḥ* SP 112.4 'wandering thru village after village'; *ārāmeṇārāmam udyānenodyānaṃ parvatapārśvena parvatapārśvam* MSV i.287.21. Apparently intensive is *dūreṇa dūraṃ* SP 287.13 'very far'; and certainly *sarveṇa sarvaṃ* 'altogether, completely'. This (see Dict. s.v. *sarva*) is extremely common. It corresponds to Pali *sabbathā sabbaṃ*, to which the precise equivalent *sarvathā sarvaṃ* also occurs in BHS, but as a rule following *sarveṇa sarvaṃ* in one long phrase (also *sarveṇa sarvaṃ sarvathā*, *sarveṇa* alone, and possibly other variations). Sen (who fails to note *sarveṇa sarvaṃ*) lists (24–25) several other cases, which are dubious or definitely not of the same sort. Thus LV 143.20 (Sen cites 163) *mayā sārdhaṃ samarthaḥ śilpena śilpam upadarśayitum* means 'able to display art for art with me' i. e. 'to rival me in art'; *cetasā cetaḥparivitarkam* (a common phrase, see Dict. s.v. *parivitarka*) has *cetaḥ* as prior member of a compound.

7.29. On a somewhat similar but rare use of abl. and acc. adverbial forms see § 7.51, besides *vanād vanaṃ* (prec.), which seems not abnormal.

Instrumental

7.30. Instrumental for locative. In BHS, historic instr. forms are extensively used in loc. function (also abl., see below). This is specially true of plural forms, particularly of *a*-stems. It can hardly be doubted that it is connected with the regular use of the endings *(e)hī* and *(a)hī* in Ap. as loc. as well as instr.; in the pl. of vocalic stems, the two cases are completely fused in Ap. (Jacobi, Bhav. 33* etc.). In BHS it is not only MIndic endings like *ehi* or the like which are often used in traditionally loc. meanings. Doubtless by analogy with them, forms in *ais* are used in the same way.

7.31. It is, however, hard to draw a line between these cases and others, including instr. sing. forms, which also show what are loc. functions in normal Skt., yet are not so readily explainable by reference to the Ap. usage just mentioned, tho they also may be fundamentally MIndic. Thus, the instr. is often used to denote the place where, as well as the time when. Some such phrases are very common in BHS, and equally common in Pali.

7.32. Place where: *yena ... tena ...* 'where, ... there' (Pali id.; Sen 23) is so constantly used that illustrations seem superfluous, e. g. *yena sa pitā tenopasaṃkrāmann* SP 75.3. This usage, or at least *yena* 'where', is not quite unknown in Skt. (at any rate epic): *prādravad yena vai saraḥ* Mbh. (Crit. ed.) 3.137.15. Others: *karṇaśrotābhyāṃ ... prakṣipya ... mukhadvāreṇa prakṣipya* LV 257.8, 10; *dvihi kulehi ... bodhisattvā jāyanti, kṣatriyakule brāhmaṇakule vā* Mv i.197.12 (note *-kule*, resuming *-kulehi*!); *ṣaṭsu gatīhi* Mv i.42.17 (vs) repeated as *ṣaṭsu gatīṣu* 53.14, and in prose 337.5 as *ṣaṭsu gatiṣu*; *so dīrghāyukehi devehi upapanno* 'he is born among the D. gods' Mv i.51.14; *tehi brāhmaṇasahasrehi* 'among these thousands of b.' Mv i.314.3; *etehi evaṃ āsanehi niṣaṇṇānāṃ* 'of them thus seated on these seats' Mv i.329.18; *caturhi padehi pratibhuko* 'surety on four points' Mv ii.141.4, repeated in next line with *padeṣu caturuṣu* (better *caturṣu* with v.l.); *etāhi śivikāhi niṣīdāhi* 'sit in these litters' Mv ii.216.17 (similarly 227.6); *devīhi upapannā* 'born among the goddesses' Mv iii.375.14; *anyāsu śayyāsanakoṭibhiś ca* SP 324.12 (only one ms. °*koṭiṣū ca*, out of at least six).—In slight extensions of the 'place where' notion: *prāṇehi ahiṃsaṃ* 'non-injury to living beings' Mv i.145.8 (loc. sense proved by repetitions of same line with *prāṇiṣu* i.202.5, *prāṇeṣv* ii.6.2); *sarvehi bhūtehi nivārya daṇḍaṃ* Mv iii.412.21 'restraining violence in reference to all beings' (the same vs Divy 339.28 has *sarveṣu bhūteṣu nidhāya*, and so also the Pali equivalent Dhp 142 *sabbesu bhūtesu*); with expressions of pity (loc. in Skt., Speyer, Skt. Syntax § 148), *tehi vikrośamānehi satvehi karuṇāṃ pratilabhitvā* Mv i.128.9 'conceiving pity for these creatures who lament'; with expressions of desire, *tasyā kākīye rājabhojanena dohalako* Mv iii.125.16, 'the female crow had a pregnancy-longing for the king's food'; *gṛddho gṛhī na* (so read) *tathā kāmair yādṛśe pravrajitva te gṛddhāḥ* RP 29.11, see Dict. s.v. *gṛhīṇa*. For others see Sen 18, infra.

7.33. In time expressions the instr. in Vedic and Skt. supposedly denotes the time 'within which' or 'during which' the action takes place (Speyer VSS § 42). In BHS as in Pali it is commonly used simply to denote the point of time 'at which', a usage perhaps not so rare in Skt. as is commonly assumed. The expressions *tena kālena*, *tena samayena* 'at that time' are common in both Pali and BHS; sometimes temporal locs. occur in the vicinity. So *tena ... samayena* SP 19.11; 20.4; shortly after the latter *tasyāṃ velāyāṃ* 20.8. Further, *apareṇa kālasamayena* LV 189.9 'at another time'; in Mv i.50.15 *ekasmiṃ kalpe nādrākṣīt*, immediately followed in 51.1 by *dvihi kalpehi nādrākṣīt, kalpasahasreṇa* (v.l. °*srehi*) *buddhaṃ loke paśyati*; loc. and instr. seem equivalent. Also *tasyaiva rātryā atyayena* Mv i.231.3 'at the end of that very night', etc. Unusual is MSV i.47.13 *yo 'sau Vipaśyi-tathāgatena gaṇavācako ...*, 'that school-teacher at the time of Vipaśyin Buddha'.

7.34. The loc. absolute is replaced by the instr., and not only in the possibly ambiguous forms ending in *ehi* (cf. § 7.30); *rājñā siṃhahanunā kālagatena śuddhodanena rājyaṃ pratilabdhaṃ* Mv i.355.20, 'when King S. was dead, Ś. obtained the kingship'; *mayā phalahāragatena* Mv ii.65.15, 'while I was gone to gather fruits' (not 'by me ...'); *nāsti mayā mṛtena teṣāṃ jīvitaṃ* Mv ii.214.7, 'there will be no living for them when I am dead'; *yam ahaṃ āryaputreṇa duḥkhitena ... bhojanāni bhuṃjeyaṃ* Mv ii.233.4–5, 'that I, while my lord is tormented ... should enjoy luxury'; *sarvair varṇai(ḥ) stutimaṅgalaiḥ pratyupasthitair* LV 119.11, 'all praises, lauds and benedictions having been presented'; *mayi parinirvṛte imehi ca śrāvakehi parinirvṛtehi imasmiṃ dharmākhyāne 'ntarahite* Mv i.50.13 (note *-ehi*, pl., parallel with loc. sg.); *candramasūryehi loke aprajñāyantehi* Mv i.339.2, and parallel forms in *ehi* in the sequel, until line 5, where in the last parallel we find *māsārdhamāseṣu loke aprajñāyamāneṣu*; *mānsehi kṣīyamāṇehi* Mv ii.239.5, in the same verse in which LV 262.4 reads *māṃseṣu kṣīyamāneṣu* (dental *n*); *sarveṇa arthena samudre vinaṣṭena* Mv iii.350.12, 'all his wealth having been lost in the sea' (no other possible construction); *paripūrṇehi ca daśahi māsehi* Mv i.148.1 (prose), 'and when ten months have been completed'

(= *pratipūrṇe daśame māse* i.148.4, vs); *aprahīṇehi kleśehi* Mv i.153.7; *asmehi jīvantehi* Mv i.313.8; etc.

7.35. Instrumental for ablative. Instr. forms are also used in functions that are normally ablative, as in Pali (Geiger 77, end). In expressions of comparison, the instr. is not unknown even in Vedic and Skt. (Speyer, VSS § 39). We may note here *uttamu sarvadevaiḥ* LV 119.5, 'supreme over all gods'; *tvayā ati-r-ivāpi* (so read with mss., see Dict. s.v. *ati-r-iva*) Mv i.129.6, 'even in excess over (in comparison with) you'; in Divy 12.29–13.1 the text presents, after a comparative, a gen. pronoun with an instr. adjective agreeing with it: *kiṃ mama kāruṇikayā tvam eva kāruṇikataraḥ*, 'are *you* really more merciful than *me*, merciful (as I am)?'; *imehi kila so viśiṣṭataro* Mv i.306.18, 'it appears that he is more distinguished than *these*!'.

7.36. Otherwise, I have noted only plural instr. forms in abl. functions. I take this to be related to the Pali and Pkt. use of plural instr. forms in abl. meaning (Geiger 77 end; Pischel 369, 381). But in BHS it is not limited to *-bhis* (*-hi*) endings; doubtless by analogy with them, *-ais* forms from *a*-stems are also so used, so that KN in note on SP 252.14 are not justified in describing the variant reading *kṣetraśatair anekaiḥ* 'from many hundreds of fields' as 'wholly wrong'. This v.l., read here by most Nep. mss., is adopted by WT, while the variant of the Kashgar rec. (and one Nep. ms.) *ye āgatāḥ kṣetrasahasrakoṭibhiḥ* 'from crores of thousands of fields' is adopted by KN, with the parallels 35.13 and 331.2, where no v.l. is recorded. Others: *karacaraṇatalebhi yāvad ūrdhvaṃ* (text *ūrddhaṃ*) LV 49.15, 'from the palms of her hands and the soles of her feet up to the top (of her head)'; *dhyānasukhebhi bhraṣṭāḥ* LV 138.5, 'fallen from the bliss of meditation'; *mocehī* (Lefm. *soc*°, misprint) *jagu vividhakileśaiḥ* LV 164.4, 'free the world from manifold impurities'; *payu tava sravi tada karatalacaraṇaiḥ* LV 166.2, 'then milk flowed from your hand-palms and feet'; *tuṇavīṇasughoṣakādibhiḥ śabdo niścarate* LV 177.14, 'a sound came forth from . . .'; *śabd' evarūpas* (so read) *turiyebhi niścarī* LV 182.19 (as prec.); *netrebhi niścarati vidyud* LV 339.18, 'from their eyes lightning comes forth'; (*ye āgatā*) *daśadiśebhir* LV 416.2, 'from the ten directions'; *dhyānehi ca abhijñāhi ca bhraṣṭo* Mv i.354.5, 'fallen away from *dhyānas* and *abhijñās*'; *anyehi pi adhiṣṭhānehi . . . āgacchati* Mv ii.74.8–9, 'and from other places too . . . came'; *kāmehi avyapakṛṣṭakāyā* Mv ii.121.3, 'whose bodies are not withdrawn from lusts'; *kacchehi svedā muktā* Mv ii.124.3, 'sweat poured from (my) arm-pits'; *mukhato* (*ca*) *nāsikāśrotrehi ca* Mv ii.124.10, 11, 13 'from mouth and nose and ears' (note *mukhato*, abl. sg.!); *trāyāmi* (text *tra*°) *sarvajanatāṃ vyasanair anekair* Gv 212.26, 'I save all folk from many disasters'.

7.37. Miscellaneous uses of the instrumental. By analogy with adjectives meaning 'like', *viṣama* 'unlike' is construed with an instr.; *lokena viṣamaṃ* Mv i.107.1, 'different from the world'. Otherwise Senart's note.

7.38. A predicative instr., the nearest approach to which in Speyer's material is the instr. with *vartate* (Skt. Synt. § 67, Rem. 1), is found with *dṛśyate*: *kasya pūrvanimittena māriṣā adya dṛśyate* SP 168.1, 'as first omen of what is seen today (that which we see)?' Cf. 167.13 *kasya khalv idaṃ pūrvanimittaṃ bhaviṣyati*, 'of what, pray, will this be the first omen?' So also with the gerund *āhūya*: *puruṣo dūtenāhūyoktaḥ* Av i.325.12 'a man, (by the king) having summoned him as messenger, was addressed'. So read with ms.; Speyer em. *dūtyenā*°, referring to Skt. Synt. § 237. But the abstract noun is *dautya*, not *dūtya*. Cf. BhG. 6.33 *yo 'yaṃ yogas tvayā proktaḥ sāmyena*, 'this discipline which is declared by thee as indifference'. The predicative instr. is equated with the subject; Speyer's § 237 deals with a different idiom.

7.39. The instr. of the stem *ātman* is used with an ordinal as an 'analytic form' of *ātma-* in composition with the ordinal; see Speyer Skt. Synt. § 300, quoting *ātmanā tṛtīyena gantavyam* 'you must go with two others' (= *ātmatṛtīyena*). So *imaṃ kumāraṃ ātmanā caturthaṃ* ('with three others,' = *ātmacaturthaṃ*) . . . *nehi* Mv ii.108.15; similarly 18, and 110.16.

7.40. Doubtful is *alpāhāratayā pratipadyeyaṃ* LV 254.2; 255.7. Weller 30 assumes that the instr. is used with the function of a dat., comparing LV 255.14 and 18 °*hāratāyai pratipadyeyam*. I may add that *pratipādayati*, caus., in BHS means 'presents (with)' and is construed with the instr. On the other hand, in view of *alpāhāratayā śuddhiṃ manyante* 254.1 (just before the above phrase), we might assume that *pratipadyeyaṃ* is used without expressed goal: 'I must undertake (to win my goal) by eating little food'.

7.41. The instr. of the logical subject is sometimes used when the following verb (usually rather remote in place) is active, logically demanding a nom.: *jyotipālena bhikṣuṇā . . . bhagavantaṃ . . . abhyakiletsuḥ* (! so mss.; Senart em. *abhyokiresi*) Mv i.335.9–10; *tāye dāni śyāmāye so mṛtako puruṣo gandhodakena snāpayitvā* . . . (other gerunds) . . . *kṛtvā teṣāṃ ceṭīnāṃ āha* Mv ii.173.5–7, 'now this Śyāmā had the corpse bathed (etc.) . . . and said to the maidservants'; *anyāhi devīhi . . . sudarśanāṃ agrato kṛtvā okastā* Mv ii.450.1–2, 'the other queens . . . putting S. in front, descended'; similarly SP 316.2–4.

7.42. By a similar blend (cf. Weller 34 f.) an instr. of the logical subject is followed by a nom. of a past participle which goes logically with it: *bhagavatā śākyamuninā . . . samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbuddha iti* SP 316.2–4 (prose); *iha mayānuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbuddhaḥ* LV 351.16–17.

Dative

7.43. Dative for genitive. As in MIndic generally, and to a considerable extent even in Skt., the dat. is extensively replaced by the gen., except for the infinitival dat. of purpose. A reflex of this is the occasional use of dat. forms in definitely gen. function. So especially with personal pronouns, e. g. *bhāṣitam agra mahyam* SP 93.6, 'my supreme word'; *mahya ime 'nyaśrāvakā* (mss.) SP 93.9, 'these my other disciples'; *upāyakauśalya . . . mahyaṃ* SP 93.13 'my clever device'; *ima sūtra mahyam* SP 95.6, 'this my sūtra'.

7.44. But also with nouns: *tebhyaḥ saṃnipatitebhyaś cittāny avalokya* Laṅk 2.14, 'beholding the hearts of those gathered together' (ed. suggests reading gen.); several times the dat. *bodhāya* (see Dict. s.v. 1 *bodha*) is used in SP in definitely gen. function (KN always emend to *bodhīya*, but the mss. must be followed), as in *te sarvi bodhāya abhūṣi lābhinaḥ* 49.14, 'they have all become attainers of enlightenment'; *yaṃ* (284.2 *yatha*) *śrutva bodhāya* (all mss.) *bhaveyu lābhino* 171.1; 284.2.

7.45. 'Expletive' or 'ethical' dative. This old inherited construction is mentioned here, by exception, because of its rarity and interest, not as being non-Sanskritic. See on Vedic and Skt. Delbrück in Brugmann's Grundriss III.298, and AIS 206 (add *te*, twice, Rigveda 1.97.4); Holtzmann, Gram. aus dem Mbh., § 285; Renou, Gr. scte. p. 297 top (where some of the Mv forms below are cited). For Latin examples, and English parallels, see Gildersleeve-Lodge, Latin Grammar, § 351; Hale and Buck, Latin Grammar, § 372. Senart Mv i note 456 compares Pali *vo* (= *vas*), Jāt. i.267.20 *passāmi vo haṃ attānaṃ*, on which the comm. says 'here *vo* is a mere particle', *ettha vo ti nipātamattaṃ*. Buddhacarita 8.58 has: *kathaṃ bata svapsyati so 'dya me vratī*, 'how, alas, will he sleep, subject to an (ascetic) vow, today . . .'; Johnston rightly

calls *me* 'expletive' and omits it in his translation. So: *alpaṃ kṛtaṃ na nāśenti kiṃ mama punar yaṃ bahuṃ* Mv i.101.13, 'they do not spoil (even) a small (good) deed; why should I speak of a large one?'; *te demi abhayaṃ jīva me ciraṃ* Mv i.131.11, 'I give thee security; live, for all I care, long!'; *bhohi no taruṇo punaḥ* Mv iii.5.14, 'become, for all I care, a young man again'.

Ablative

7.46. Ablative for instrumental. As instr. forms are used with abl. meanings (§ 7.36), so also the reverse happens with abl. pl. forms, perhaps by false Sanskritization of MIndic endings in *-hi*: *veṇubhyo . . . raṇante* LV 163.13, 'they make a noise with pipes'; *ādharṣitā ca vadhabandhanatāḍanebhyo* Mv i.84.2, 'violated by slaying, imprisonment, beating'; *deśikaṃ saha caurebhyaḥ anujānāmi jīvitaṃ* Mv i.132.14, 'to the guide with the thieves I grant life' (or is *caurebhyaḥ* understood as dat., *saha* being an independent adverb, the construction blended? see § 7.17).

7.47. Predicative ablative. Like the instr. (§ 7.38), the abl. is used predicatively with expressions of recognizing, declaring, and the like; it is to be rendered in English by 'as . . .': *yo 'tyayam atyayato dṛṣṭvā pratideśayaty* LV 379.13, 'who, recognizing his sin as a sin, confesses it'; the passage Mv i.173.1 ff. contains a series of such expressions, in which noms. with following *iti* vary with the abl. forms: *nāhaṃ . . . ye dharmā anityās te nityato deśayāmi*, 'I do not teach impermanent dharmas as permanent', and many like it. In lines 6–7 *nāpi ye dharmā rūpiṇas te arūpiṇo deśayāmi*, the word *arūpiṇo* is probably meant for acc. pl., tho it could, of course, be abl. sg. See Senart Mv i note 515, on this passage, referring to the like in Pali (*sāraṃ ca asārato ñatvā* Dhp.12).

7.48. Miscellaneous. With *yāvat* 'until', the abl. is sometimes used instead of the normal acc. (or loc.), doubtless by analogy of *ā* plus abl. 'until'. The usage occurs sporadically in epic Skt.: Speyer, Skt. Synt. § 169; VSS § 90.14. Exx.: *yāvat tasya . . . -nirvāṇakālasamayāt* SP 160.5 f. (vv.ll. °*samaye*, °*samayo 'bhūt*); *yāvad brahmalokāt* SP 164.1 (no v.l.); *yāvad bhavāgrād* SP 365.1 (no v.l.); *yāvat kṛkāṭikāto* Mv i.17.10; 19.7 (*yāva k°*); *yāvad abhiniṣkramaṇato* Mv i.157.15.

7.49. A double *yāvat* (each, or at least the second, usually followed by *ca*) is used in the sense of 'from . . . up to . . .' (Dict.). The following nouns are commonly acc. or nom., but at least once abl.: *yāvac ca nadyā nairañjanāyā yāvac ca bodhimaṇḍādes* (Calc. with v.l. °*maṇḍād*) LV 273.9, 'from the River N. up to the bodhimaṇḍa'.

7.50. On the partitive abl., not unknown to Skt., see § 20.55.

7.51. In Divy 182.28–29 occurs a curious use of adverbial abl. plus acc. forms, apparently with intensive meaning. This reminds one of the not dissimilar use of instr. and acc. forms mentioned § 7.28: *saṃghāt saṃghaṃ pūgāt pūgaṃ saṃgamya samāgamya*, 'assembling and coming together in crowds, in quantities'.

7.52. Unparalleled, as far as I know, is the following: *pratinivṛtta-to dāsyatha* MSV i.103.6, 'you will give it after I have returned'; *-tas* added to stem of the ppp. Tib. cited slar (wrongly printed sla ra) ḥoṅs na.

Genitive

7.53. Genitive absolute. This is far commoner than in Skt., but since it is well known in Skt. too (Speyer, Skt. Synt. p. 286 ff.; VSS § 211 f.), it perhaps hardly requires illustration. It is by no means limited to use *anādare* (Pāṇ. 2.3.38); for example, this sense is not present in *sthitamātrasya buddhasya* Laṅk 4.9; *jātasya mahyam* LV 118.21; *etasya nirgatasyā* LV 202.7; *teṣāṃ . . . āgacchantāṃ* (so mss.) Mv i.18.10, in parallel passage i.21.5 *teṣu . . . āgacchanteṣu*.

7.54. Genitive for ablative. The genitive is used for a regular Skt. ablative in a number of constructions; to some extent the same is true of Skt. (Speyer, Skt. Synt. §§ 125–128; VSS §§ 73–74). So the abl. of time: *cirasya* Mv i.237.16–18; 246.7 etc., common; *nacirasya* Mv i.232.2.

7.55. With verbs of fearing: *teṣāṃ pakṣiṇāṃ bhītā* Mv i.7.7; *saced bhāyasi* (later ms. *bibheṣi*) *duḥkhasya* Ud ix.3.

7.56. With verbs of separation, departure, deprivation: for the Pali phrase *agārasmā* (or *agārā*) *anāgariyaṃ pabbajati*, the corresponding BHS also uses abl. forms of *agāra*, usually *agārād* (Mv also °*rāto*, °*rato*) *anagāriyaṃ* (°*kāṃ* etc.) . . ., in most texts: Mv i.128.10 (*agārebhyo 'nagāriyaṃ pravrajitvā*); ii.69.1; 161.5 ff.; iii.176.2; 378.4; 408.2; Av i.136.6; 234.1; LV 18.8; 101.19; 103.20; Divy 17.16–17; 37.12; 141.1; Samādh 8.15; Bbh 26.12; Bhīk 10b.1. But in Mv the gen. *agārasya* is quite as common. It occurs Mv i.322.15 *agārasyānagāriyaṃ pravrajasi*; 323.1; ii.117.18, 20; 140.3; 271.8; iii.50.11–12; 213.2–3, at least.

7.57. Others: *svayaṃkṛtānāṃ karmaṇāṃ palāyitum* Mv ii.214.18 f.; 217.4 'to escape from the deeds done by oneself'; *aśravaṇād dharmasya parihīyate* LV 403.10 (and read so for *aśrutavān dh°* in 403.6); . . . °*yante* 404.9, 'is (are) deprived of the law, thru not hearing it'.

7.58. With the prepositions *ā* and *yāvat* (cf. § 7.48) 'up to, until': *ā muhūrtasya* (ed. prints as one word) Mv iii.296.18 'up to a moment', i. e. 'before a moment had passed'; *yāvat paramasaṃbodhiprāptasya* Mv i.45.11.

7.59. After comparatives: *na ca me* (Kashgar rec. *matto*) *kaścid viśiṣṭataro 'stīti* SP 134.11 (prose), 'and there is no one more distinguished than I'; *mama uttari yo* (text *uttariyo*) LV.119.3 (vs), 'who is beyond me'; *naitasya* (text *ne°*) . . . *uttari* LV 125.5 (vs), 'not higher than he'; *mama kāruṇikayā* etc. Divy 13.1, see § 7.35.

7.60. Genitive for instrumental. The gen. occurs sporadically in place of a Skt. instrumental. With *sārdhaṃ* (as also occasionally in Pali with *saddhiṃ*, Childers, PTSD): *dhītuḥ sārdhaṃ* Mv i.36.14 'with the daughter'; acc. to Senart also *mātuḥ sārdhaṃ* Mv ii.26.1, but the mss. here read *bodhisattvo ca māyā* (Senart em. *māyāya*) *ca mātuḥ sārdhaṃ śivikā samārūḍhāḥ* (Senart em. °*ḍho*). We must understand *mātuḥ* as nom. sg. (§ 13.23): 'The B. and Māyā his mother mounted together on the litter'.

7.61. Of price or value: *imasya śatasahasrasya keśaram* Mv i.38.4, 'keśara for the price of this hundred thousand'.

7.62. Another associative use: *te sametya vararūpadhāriṇāṃ* Mv i.81.18, 'they, joining the Bearers of the Best Form (Buddhas)'; the parallel 48.1 reads *upetya . . . °dhāriṇo* (acc. pl.).

7.63. Genitive for dative. The gen. in practically all the senses of the dative (excepting only that of purpose) is so familiar even in Sanskrit (and so universal in MIndic) that it seems unnecessary to illustrate it. I shall only cite a few instances in which the gen., apparently substituting for a Skt. dat., is used of the 'indirect object' or remoter goal (a person): *saṃprāpayāmi* (read °*mī*, with WT) *ima teṣa prāṇinām* SP 45.5, 'I bring it (sc. dharma) to these creatures'; *vadhakāṃ* (text *ba°*) *sa tavā upanetī* (so read, for text °*trī*; most mss. *panetī*) LV 168.18, 'he brought slayers to thee'; *jinamātur* (or °*tuḥ*) *upagatā draṣṭumanā* Mv i.146.7 = 203.8 = ii.7.4, 'came to the Jina's mother, intending to see (her)'; *kasya vā garahāmy aham* Mv ii.480.15, 17; iii.16.5, 7 'or to whom shall I make complaint?' (gen. for dat. of the person complained to: otherwise Senart's note).—With verbs of speaking: *bhagavāṃ veṇuvane bhikṣuṇāṃ āmantrayati* Mv iii.63.15, 'addresses the monks'; *sārthavāho teṣāṃ avaruddhānāṃ vāṇijakānām āha* Mv iii.73.6; *evaṃ caiṣāṃ vadati* SP 79.7.

7.64. Genitive in predicate with forms of bhavati. Very familiar is the idiom gen. plus *etad* (rarely *evaṃ*, or omitted) *bhavati* = Pali *hoti* (usually preterite verb-forms in both languages), 'this thought occurred to him; he thought as follows', generally with following direct quotation. All texts have this idiom, and in narration it is extremely common. A few examples: *mahāsattvasyaitad abhūt* SP 7.4; *teṣāṃ sarveṣāṃ etad abhavat* SP 33.7; *teṣāṃ ... etad abhūt* LV 26.4; *tasyaitad abhūt* LV 101.5; *teṣām evaṃ bhavati* Mv i.30.4; *mahāmaudgalyāyanasya ... etad abhavat* 54.11–12; *tasya (dāni) etad abhūṣi* 232.7, 9; *tasya rājño bhavati* 272.2, 'that king thought'; *ṛṣisya bhavati* ii.32.7 'the *ṛṣi* thought'; *asyā etad abhavat* Divy 67.7; *teṣāṃ ... evaṃ bhavati* 68.6, etc.; *teṣāṃ ... etad abhūt* Jm 41.23; *śakrasya ... etad abhavat* Mmk 663.14; *tasyaitad abhavat* Suv 6.7.

7.65. Genitive with miscellaneous verbs. Most of these verbs seem rarely, if ever, to be construed with gen. in Skt. Some of them are noted by Sen.

7.66. Verbs of intellectual perception, and the like (some, such as *budh*, are so used in Skt.): *teṣāṃ mānasī-karonti* SP 87.2, 'they take note of these things'; *guṇānām ātmani prajānīte* LV 141.9, '(womenfolk) make claim or profession of virtues in themselves' (but v.l. *guṇān*).

7.67. Verbs of desiring, seeking (Speyer, VSS § 67): *spṛhentu tāvan mama darśanasya* SP 324.10; *tava pradīkṣante* (= *pratīkṣante*) LV 185.7 'gaze (longingly) toward thee'.

7.68. *śru* 'hear': *sthavirasya mahāmaudgalyāyanasya śrutvā* Mv i.8.15 (see Senart's note); *śṛṇotha mama bhāṣataḥ* 10.8; *sthavirasya śrutvā* 29.16; 30.14; *tasya grāmikasya śrutvā* 302.3; *āyuṣmato ānandasya pratyaśroṣi* 317.18, 'agreed to'. — *asmāka* (m.c. for °*kaṃ*), in SP 116.7 *śrutvā ca asmāka*, may be considered an acc., see § 20.48.

7.69. Verbs meaning 'praise, honor' and the like: *tasyā nabhe vrajanto stavayiṃsu apsarāṇi* (so read with most mss.) LV 223.8 (vs), 'Apsarases, moving in the sky, praised him'; cf. also LV 195.10, § 20.16; *tasya me ... paramayā pūjayā pūjayet paramayā ca praśaṃsayā praśaṃse* Mv ii.119.2–3; *parikīrtaya* (for *paryakīrtayat*) *rājaputrasya* Mv ii.205.6 (vs).

7.70. Verbs of asking (cf. Sen 33) may take the gen. (1) of the person questioned, as well as (2) of the thing asked about. (1) *mātāpitṝṇāṃ ... pṛcche* LV 231.17; *bhikṣūṇāṃ pṛcchanti* Mv i.300.5, 12; *amātyānāṃ pṛcchati* ii.155.14; *ṛṣikumārāṇāṃ pṛcchanti* i.355.1; *teṣāṃ mṛgarājānāṃ pṛcchati* 360.14; *teṣāṃ puruṣāṇāṃ pṛcchati* ii.208.6; —(2) *bodhisattvasyānyonyaṃ paripṛcchanti sma* LV 20.11 'asked one another about the B.'; *sarveṣa teṣa* (so text with best mss., v.l. *sarveṣu teṣu*) *paripṛcchati* LV 303.2, 'asked about all these things'; *paripṛcchanti sūtrasya vinayasya mātṛkāyāḥ* Divy 18.15.

7.71. The root *bādh* 'oppress' (cf. Sen 33, also Pāṇ. 2.3.56): *na ca kasyacit sattvasya rāgo bādhate* LV 52.12 (prose); *no ca tasya rāgadoṣa naiva moha bādhate* LV 75.9 (vs); *bhikṣusaṃghasya bādhituṃ* Mv i.314.9 (prose); *yo bādhate pūrvakarisya rājño* Mv ii.184.12 (vs; mss. °*kārisya rājaṃ*, Senart em.).

7.72. The root *han* 'slay' seems sometimes to take the gen., tho this is not entirely certain: *haneyu mahyaṃ* LV 232.1 (vs), 'they might kill me' (but possibly *mahyaṃ* may be understood as acc., by analogy with *mama* which is certainly so used; § 20.12, and cf. § 20.16 *te ... nihaniṣyāmi*); *nihanitvana māracamūnāṃ* Samādh 22.5, 'having slain the hosts of Māra' (two mss. out of four °*camūnī*; possibly read so, despite the fact that *camū* is a fem. noun). (Pāṇ. 2.3.56 prescribes the gen. with *ni-pra-han*.)

7.73. *abhivādayati* is used of salutation, particularly, tho not exclusively, at departure. Is this the reason for the (isolated?) use of the gen. in Mv i.354.14? If so this should perhaps be included under ablatival genitives, above: *mātāpitṛṇāṃ abhivāditvā* (mss.), 'having taken respectful leave of their parents'.

7.74. *ava-man* 'despise': *brāhmaṇānāṃ avamanyitvā* Mv i.309.11, 'scorning the brahmans'.

7.75. *vi-smi* 'be astonished' (in Skt. with instr., abl., loc.): *rājā ṛṣisya vismito* Mv ii.32.1, 'the king was astonished at the *ṛṣi*' (pple. as periphrasis for finite verb).

7.76. The root *śuc* 'grieve (for)': *asmākam eṣā ekaputrasya śocati* Mv ii.174.19 f., 'she grieves for our only son' (just before, 174.18–19, *śocantī* governs acc., as in normal Skt.).

7.77. *upa-sthā* 'wait upon': *teṣāṃ mātāpitṝṇām upasthihati* Mv ii.211.17.

7.78. *pari-rakṣ* 'protect': *teṣāṃ śakuntakānāṃ parirakṣati* Mv ii.251.4.

7.79. It is alleged (e. g. by Senart on Mv i.123.13, and by Sen 41) that verbs of ruling govern the gen., as in Vedic and rarely in later Skt. (Speyer, Skt. Synt. § 118). But the instances noted are not convincing: *śāstā śāsati prāṇinām* Mv i.123.13 may mean 'the Teacher of creatures rules'; in Mv i.349.3 the gens. are partitive, depending on *kiṃcit*; in Mv ii.420.7 the gen. is objective, depending on the noun *rājyaṃ* (*kārayati*), 'he does the ruling af 60,000 cities'.

Locative

7.80. The uses of the loc. in Skt. itself are so free and extensive that little enlargement of its scope seems possible, and I have not noted much.

7.81. Loc. for instr.: Senart Mv i n.603, assumes this for *pitari* i.310.17; but see §§ 13.33 ff.; *pitari* and *pitare* are common oblique-case forms and there is no reason to consider them primarily loc. But in Mv ii.38.15–16 *niśāmya dvātriṃśallakṣaṇeṣu upāgatam, tathā anuvyañjanehi*, 'perceiving him attended by the 32 marks and the subsidiary signs', the loc. pl. form seems to be equivalent to the instr., and even parallel with the following instr. in *-ehi*. This is doubtless a reflex of the use of *ehi* forms as locs., § 7.30.

7.82. Loc. for ablative: *ato mahānarake nirmuktāḥ* Mv i.6.16, 'freed from this great hell' (cf. Senart's notes on this and the next); (for abl. of comparison) *nagne vinagnatara te vicaranti loke* LV 158.22 (vs), 'they go about in the world more completely naked than (lit. 'in reference to'?) a naked man'; (with verbs of fearing) *daṇḍesu saṃtrāsita tatra-tatra* SP 94.10, 'they are frightened, in every place, of ('in regard to'?) clubs' (Kashgar rec. and WT *daṇḍena*); *utpāṭane 'haṃ na bibhemi ... netradvayasya* Divy 411.24, 'I am not afraid of the plucking out of my two eyes'.

7.83. Loc. for (dat. or) gen.: *prāṇahareṣv api teṣu abhayaṃ dattvā* Mv i.132.12 (prose), 'having granted security to them, murderers tho they were' (indirect object); *śrutvā svastiku vāca nāyake suruciramadhurāṃ* LV 287.13 (vs), 'Svastika, having heard the charming sweet voice of (lit. 'in'?) the Guide' (possessive gen.; some mss. unmetrically *nāyaka*).

8. A-stems

8.1. For the most part the forms to be noted here are fairly simple and obvious products of MIndic, or semi-MIndic, phonology and morphology. They are arranged under the several cases, except that we shall first treat the use of the uninflected stem form for various oblique cases, and follow this with certain exceptional and un-Sanskritic forms assumed by, or substituted for, the stem in the prior part of compounds.

8.2. Attention may further be called here to the borrowing of endings from the *s*-declension (instr. sg. *-asā*, nom.-acc. pl. nt. *-āṃsi*), and to the sporadic use of characteristically feminine endings, borrowed from the *ā*-declension, in various cases (acc., inst., dat. sg.; nom, and perhaps voc. and inst. pl.). We shall see that fem. *ā*-stems show the converse of this, § 9.4. This is an aspect of the confusion between forms of different genders, on which see §§ 6.1 ff. In § 6.6 are listed the pertinent sections of this chapter on *a*-stems.

Stem in *-a* as oblique case form

8.3. In HJAS 1.66 ff. I showed that the stem in *a* is used in LV for any oblique singular case-form, citing inst., abl., gen., and loc. instances. In JAOS 59.369 ff. I pointed out that the same thing is recognized for Prakrit (Māhārāṣṭrī and other dialects) by some Prakrit grammarians. I should have added that Hemacandra 4.344, 345 prescribes 'loss of ending' in Ap. for nom. and acc. sg. and pl., and 'generally' for the genitive.

8.4. For our dialect, more evidence, from a number of other texts, has now come to light. No doubt the phenomenon is commoner even than the following list suggests. I have included only cases where the form in *-a* could not, in my opinion, reasonably be interpreted as nom. or acc., or as stem in composition. There are many ambiguous cases where interpretation as an oblique case in *-a* would be quite possible.

8.5. It is evident that this development of a sort of generalized singular form, identical with the 'stem' used in composition, resembles the condition found in most modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars, which have for many nouns only one form in the singular, for others only two forms, one of which is used as 'inflectional base' before postpositions.

8.6. Only the ablative forms, which are found only in verses, may be regarded as shortenings of *-ā(t)* m.c. All the forms are found mostly in verses but occasionally in prose.—My pupil Mr. Andrew H. Yarrow suggests that in the locative, *-a* might be a generalized inheritance from the Skt. saṃdhi-form of final *-e* before vowels (other than *a-*). It may be an accident, but it is true, that these *-a* forms seem commoner as locs. than otherwise.

8.7. An alternative explanation for a few forms of this sort is suggested by Senart Mv i.499, note on Mv i.155.17 (vs), which Senart reads *bherimṛdaṅga yadi śaṅkhasahasraśabdaṃ* (*kuryāt*) etc. Senart thinks we must understand *bherimṛdaṅga-śaṅkhasahasra-śabdaṃ* as a single noun cpd., which is 'divided' by the word *yadi*. In fact, however, *bherimṛdaṅga* (read *bherī°*, m.c.) and *śaṅkhasahasra* are noms., parallel subjects of *kuryāt*, and *śabdaṃ* is its object. No such division of a cpd. as Senart suggests is possible, even in BHS. Moreover, even if it could be assumed, it would not suffice to explain quite a number of the following cases, such as the first.

8.8. Instrumental: *ārogya dhig vividhavyādhiparāhatena* LV 191.3 (vs), 'fie upon health, which is afflicted with all sorts of diseases'. Note the adjective *-parāhatena*, agreeing with *ārogya*; and the parallel *dhig yauvanena* in preceding line. Possibly *saṃkalpa* (q.v., Dict.) in LV 419.17.

8.9. Ablative: *tat sādho puravara ita śīghraṃ niṣkramyā* LV 163.20 (vs) 'so, O saint, go forth quickly from this excellent city' (Skt. *puravarād*); *ceṭīya sakāśa jāto* KP 81.9 (vs) 'born from a slave-girl' (*sakāśa* = *°śāt*); *duḥkhasamudra vimocayi sattvā* Suv 51.15 (vs); *anyatra karma sukṛtād* LV 37.7 (vs) (*karma*, abl. of *a*-stem for *n*-stem, § 17.13).

8.10. Genitive: *yāvaj jarāmaraṇa cāntakaraḥ prasūtaḥ* LV 47.20 (vs) 'and before he is born as Ender of old age and death'; *mahāpadma yathodbhavaḥ* 97.15 (vs) 'as (there is) springing up of a great lotus'. So the best ms. A; both edd. *mahāpadmo*, which makes no sense. This is one of the cases interpreted by Senart (above) as a 'divided compound' (= Skt. *mahāpadmodbhavaḥ*); *suvyaktaṃ jinaratna jambunilaye dharmākarasyodbhavaḥ* 109.4 (vs) 'clearly in the home of the jambu there is birth of the Jina-jewel, the Mine of the Law.' Note gen. of appositional epithet, agreeing with *jinaratna*. — *duḥkhāni saṃsāra acintiyāni* Suv 61.9 (vs). Tib. renders as gen., 'the miseries of the saṃsāra.' — *sattva* (v.l. adds *-m-*, Hiatus-bridger) *aśeṣata niṣṭha tathaiva* Bhad 46. Here *sattva* parallels *nabhasya* of the preceding pāda, and can only be gen.

8.11. Locative: *na khalu punar bhikṣavo māyā devī bodhisattva kukṣigate gurukāyatāṃ saṃjānīte sma* LV 71.5 (prose) ('while the B. was in her womb'); *tahi nṛpa* 166.6 (vs), all mss. and both edd., = *tasmin nṛpe*; *nidhi dṛṣṭa* (one ms. and Calc. *dṛṣṭi*) *yathā hi palāyati ko ci naro* 323.11 (vs) 'as some man might run away when a treasure is seen'; *dṛṣṭa eva dharma* 409.12 (prose) (so mss.; Lefm. em. foolishly, see Weller ad loc.; Weller would emend to *dharme*). — *mūla* Mv i.204.16 (vs); so mss., Senart em. *mūle*, which is unmetrical; parallel ii.8.11 *mūli*, which is possible; *na tailabindu jinastūpa dattvā* ii.385.15 (vs) 'not having given a drop of oil at a stūpa of a Jina'; so mss.; Senart em. *°stūpe*, which is unmetrical; *vāpiyodaka* (v.l. *vāpī°*; Senart em. *°dake*, which is unmetrical) *snāyituṃ* (mss. *snāpituṃ*) iii.12.5 (vs) 'to bathe in the water of the pond'; *antara* (mss.; Senart em. *antare*, unmetrical) *tiṣṭhati* iii.23.4. — *kalpa anāgata bodhi careyam* Suv 53.7 (vs) 'in a future age'. — *nirvṛtau ca sthiti dharma yādṛśī* RP 6.9 (vs) 'and of what sort is the situation in the state (of) nirvāṇa,' *dharma* and *nirvṛtau* in apposition; *druma puṣpaphalāḍhye* 26.19 (vs) 'in a tree rich in flowers and fruit'. — *tasmin saddharma kṣīṇe* SP 67.8 (prose), 'when that good law had perished'; *kṣīṇa* can only be an adj. and *saddharma* a separate word; cf. the verse version 69.1 *saddharmi* (so Kashgar rec. but Nep. mss. *°ma*) *kṣīṇe*; unless we em. to *saddharme*, I see no real alternative to *°ma* as loc.

Stem final in composition

8.12. Several times in verses, a nom. sg. form in *-aḥ* or *-o* is used instead of the 'stem' in *-a*, as prior member of a compound. In some of these, where *-aḥ* is followed by a sibilant, the visarga could perhaps be interpreted as doubling of the following sibilant m.c.; cf. lengthening of *a* to *ā* in the same circumstances, below. Or, since as we shall presently see *-u* is also substituted for stem-final *-a* in composition, both *-aḥ* (*-o*) and *-u* might be analogical to the frequent variation of word-final, and especially nom. sg., *-aḥ* with *-a* and *-u*. Yet the occurrence of similar nom. sg. forms of *u*-stems in composition (§ 12.4), and of dual and plural noms. used similarly in compounds (see §§ 23.5, 6), inclines me to believe that we are dealing with the morphological peculiarity first suggested. See also § 23.7 for one or two sporadic cases which might be similarly interpreted, but permit an alternative explanation ('hiatus-bridging' consonants *r* and *m*, instead of nom. endings). *akṣayomati* SP 447.2, 4 (vss); for *akṣayamati*, so always in prose. — *ākāśaḥsamatulyamānasā* LV 325.16 (vs) 'with minds quite the same as ether'. — *Varalakṣaṇaḥśiri* (= *Varalakṣaṇaśrī*) Gv 284.24 (vs); *Vajrāśayogiriśirī* (= *Vajrāśayagiriśrī*) 285.13 (vs); *Dharmaḥsamudra* (divide thus) 285.16 (vs); same in longer cpds., see Dict.

8.13. Occasionally also a form in *-u*, evidently a transfer from the nom. sg. (which very commonly ends in *-u* as well as *-a*) by analogy, is used in verses as stem in composition, as in: *Gandharvakāyu-prabharāja* Gv 284.21 (vs), name of a Buddha; *Samuśarīru* (for *Samaśarīraḥ*) 285.10 (vs).

8.14. A neuter nom.-acc. form in *-aṃ* is also sometimes used in the prior member of a cpd.: e. g. LV 429.8 (prose) *prāṇātipāta-vairamaṇyaṃ-parasattvasamādāyanatvād*, and 9 °*ṇyaṃ-guṇavarṇasaṃprakāśanatvād*; 429.13 (prose) *sattvasaṃgrahakauśalyaṃ-suśikṣitatvād*, 'thru his being very learned in the skill (*kauśalya*; so Calc. reads, but all mss. °*yaṃ*) of drawing-in (attracting) creatures (by the 'net' of the 4 saṃgrahavastūni).' No other construction seems possible, but perhaps the anusvāra should be deleted, despite the mss., three times.

8.15. Very common is the lengthening m.c., in verses, of *a* to *ā* as stem-final in the prior member of compounds. (Cf. Pali, Geiger 33.) A few examples, which might be multiplied indefinitely, will be furnished presently. There are, however, also cases in prose, at least well supported in the mss. Are these somehow related to the rhythmic lengthening of stem-final (and other final) *a* to *ā* in Vedic texts (Ved. Var. II, chapter XI, esp. § 466)? Or are they to be interpreted as nom. pl. forms substituted for the 'stem' in composition? See § 8.12. *kāmāvacarā-devebhyaḥ* LV 83.6 (prose; all mss., confirmed by Weller's ms., Weller 23); (*sarvarāgadveṣamohadarpārativiṣāda-*) *bhayā-lobherṣyāmātsaryavigatāḥ* 86.5 (prose); so all mss.; Calc. °*bhaya*°; [*asaṃkhyayā-kalpakoṭinayutaśatasahasraiḥ* 86.15 (prose) can scarcely concern us here; read possibly with 2 mss. *asaṃkhyeyā-* (which would then be an example belonging here), but more likely *asaṃkhya-* with two mss. and Calc., or possibly *asaṃkhyayā* as a separate word, inst. of *a-saṃkhyā*, 'without number';] *kulikā-śatāni* 95.8 (prose) 'hundreds of noble youths (*kulika*)'; cf. Weller 24; note that the same phrase occurs, out of place, in 94.3 reading *kulikaśatāni*; *śakaṭā-cakrāṇi* 381.14 (prose) 'cart-wheels'; all mss.; Calc. *śakaṭa-*; *sarvabodhipākṣikā-dharmaratna*° 424.12 (prose); so nearly all mss.; one ms. and Calc. °*pākṣika*°; *asaktābaddhā-muktacittatvāt* 424.13 (prose); all mss. have *-ā* here, only Calc. *-a*; *saṃgrahā-vastujñānena* 437.15 (vs, but hardly *ā* m.c.; initial in anuṣṭubh line); so both edd., no v.l.; the compound *saṃgrahavastu* is commonplace.

8.16. The adjective which in Skt. is *ratnamaya* 'made of jewels' occurs repeatedly in Mv, even in prose (e. g. i.31.5; 32.3, 5, 10; ii.109.3 twice, 5), as *ratnāmaya* or *ratanāmaya*. Such forms have been noted in other texts only in verses, e. g. SP 11.4, 89.1, 91.5, 340.13 (here however not required by meter, and two mss. read *ratna*°); LV 59.7. Cf. in Pkt. (JM.) *-rayaṇāmao* Jacobi, Ausgew. Erz. 39.8 (prose).

8.17. Other cases, in verses, where *ā* is required or strongly favored by the meter are (a few among very many): *dharmā-mukhā* SP 53.5; *śatāpadī* 84.2; 86.1; *candanāmayān* 119.9; *jinā-nayaṃ* 145.9. — *chattrā-paṭāka* LV 43.17; *divyācakṣuṣa* (so, as cpd.) 108.16. — *acalā-dhṛtiḥ* Mv i.98.11, repeated i.100.1; *samāsamo* = *sama-samaḥ* ii.488.12. — *narā-surāṇām* Suv 24.5.

Nominative singular masculine

8.18. Nom. sg. -o. As in MIndic dialects, the ending *-o*, used for *-as* only before voiced consonants and *a-* in Skt., is generalized, and often occurs before other vowels, voiceless consonants, or a pause. In most texts such forms are recorded only in verses, but in Mv also very commonly in prose. A few examples (the Mv ones all prose except the last; those not from Mv are verses): *māro sa* SP 63.6; *ratho ī-* 91.2; *samarpito k-* 111.6. — *śabdo* LV 80.15 (end of line, before pause); *nirdhāvito k-* 92.11. — *so prativiśiṣṭo* (before pause) Mv i.3.2; *gaveṣanto s-* 3.10; *gaveṣanto* 3.11 (before pause); *jino ca-* 3.12; *bodhisattvo s-*, and *kālajño samayajño p-* 4.1; *bhāvayanto sugato c-* 4.3; *-bhirato* 109.6 (vs, end of line, before pause).

8.19. Occasionally the writing *-o* is kept even where meter requires a short (§ 3.74): *smṛto saṃprajāno* Mv i.207.10 (vs); both *-o*'s short. In repetition *smṛta* (mss. °*ti*) *saṃprajāna* ii.11.21. Read as separate words, nom. sg., not with Senart as cpd. Also in pronouns, e. g. *ko ci* SP 99.1 (vs); *ko puni* LV 151.8 (vs).

8.20. Nom. sg. -u. A shortening of this *-o* is to be seen in the ending *-u*, which is extremely common in most texts, but only in verses, and almost invariably in positions requiring a short; rarely in metrically indifferent positions, as at the end of a line. This ending is rare in Mv, and apparently never used in Mv prose, tho at least once it is found at the end of a line of verse. Cf. Senart's notes, i.478 and 537; my §§ 1.95, 3.51 ff. The ending is reported by Pischel 346 only for Ap. (where it is very common) and Ḍhakkī. It is also common in the dialect of the 'Prakrit Dhammapada' (Dutreuil de Rhins ms.). See further under *-u* for *-aṃ*, § 3.58. A few examples: *kalpu* SP 68.1; *satkāru* 93.3; *utpannu* 177.9 (initial in anuṣṭubh, not m.c.). — *priyu* LV 46.13; *gajavaru* 56.16; *samayu* 162.10 (at end of a line; no metrical ground for shortening; no v.l.). — Mv (only in verses, and not common) *eṣu* Mv i.131.4; *gṛddhu* i.179.20; *sthitu* i.204.14 (but in repetition *sthita* ii.8.9); *abhiratu* ii.326.17; *kavacitu* ii.371.14 (Senart em. °*to*; meter obscure to me); *satkṛtu* ii.372.7 (v.l. °*ta*); *suruciru praśastu* ii.372.12 (v.l. °*ra*, °*ta*); *vipāku* ii.393.21; *vegajātu* ii.399.5; *-kovidu* ii.405.6 (end of line; no metrical reason for shortening; is the form influenced by the synonym *vidu*? see Dictionary s.v. *vidu*). — *utpannu* Samādh 8.21; *abhāvu* 8.23; *tāvantu . . . svaru* 8.25, etc. (very common). — *dṛṣṭu* RP 4.5; *niketu* 16.6; *arthiku* 17.1, etc. (common). — *niṣaṇṇaku* Bhad 3; *dhārmiku*, *pradakṣiṇu* 15; *-smaru* 16; *peśalu*, *parikṣayu* 19, etc. (common). — *sthitu* Gv 34.6; *prasthitu* 54.1; *niścayu* 54.2; *-ghoṣu* 241.7 (common). — *sadṛśu* Sukh 7.17; *gabhiru vipulu sukṣmaprāptu* 7.18 (read *sū*°?); etc. (common). (Not noted in Divy.)

8.21. Nom. sg. -ū. Once we find *-ū* instead of *-o* as a metrical lengthening of the *-u* of the preceding section; cf. *-a* (for *-as*) occasionally lengthened to *-ā* m.c. (? § 8.24): *mārgū viśodhitu jinānāṃ* Gv 258.20 (vs). No other interpretation is possible; cf. line 25 below, *mārgu viśodhito*. Of course some might emend to *mārgo*. But the analogous forms in *-ā*

may support -*ū* indirectly. Both -*u* and (perhaps) -*a* attained enough general currency to stand on their own feet, so to speak, and to be lengthened to *ū* and *ā* when meter required a long.

8.22. Nom. sg. -a. Even commoner than -*u* is the ending -*a* for -*as*, as in Ap. and m.c. in AMg. Mg., Pischel 364. In our dialect it occurs almost exclusively in verses m.c.; even Mv seems hardly to show it in prose but almost only in verses, and even there not very commonly. At least twice, however, LV has prose occurrences: *māraputra brahmā* LV 44.11 (absurdly printed as cpd. by Lefm.; Calc. °*putro*; no other v.l. cited; can only be nom. sg.); *mahāvaipulya* (so divide) *bodhi-* LV 438.20. In two other prose cases there is seeming fusion of -*a* for -*as* with a following initial *a*-: *madāpagataḥ* LV 86.7 (for *mado 'pa*°) and *dharmādhigataḥ* 239.7 (for *dharmo 'dhi*°). The only case I have noted from prose in Mv is i.132.2, where all mss. *prāpya khalu ayam*; Senart em. *prāpyo*. For another erroneously alleged case in prose (LV 377.10) see HJAS 1.69.—Cf. the use of -*a* as oblique case-ending, above, § 8.3 ff.

8.23. The rest all come from verses. Only a few out of an enormous mass of cases are cited: *saddharma* SP 68.12; *uccāra* 85.14; *vimukta* 92.8; etc. — *samartha* LV 29.3; *nāsti sattva yo daridra* 76.1; *dvija* 165.17; etc. — *ākāṅkṣamāṇa* Mv i.204.15 (in repetition ii.8.10 °*ṇā*, Senart em. °*ṇo*, unmetrically); *śakra* ii.54.2; *artha* ii.54.5; *āditya* ii.55.12 (separate from the following word); *sukhita* ii.371.20; *niścaya* iii.253.18; *pratikūla* iii.367.19. In all these Senart allows the -*a* of the mss., favored by the meter, to stand. In many others, however, he emends to -*o* (or sometimes -*as*), contrary to the meter; of course the reading of the mss. should in such cases always be restored. Such cases are: *abhavya* i.292.9; *nṛpa* ii.13.8; *avatīrṇa* ii.91.8; *uccāra* ii.325.15; *sphuṭa* ii.336.6 and 374.3; *śakya* ii.347.17 (but in 348.2 and 6 Senart keeps *śakya* of the mss.); *parivāra* ii.378.3 and 387.1; *niṣaṇṇa* ii.408.15; *jātyandha* ii.409.9. — *buddha* Samādh 8.6, 31 etc. — -*samudra* Suv 53.11 ff. etc. — -*citrita* RP 3.6; *guṇasāgara* 4.5; *śakra* 6.16, etc. — *padma* . . . *sūrya* Bhad 20; *praviṣṭa* 32; etc. —Also in pronouns, e. g. *ya* = *yaḥ* LV 165.12 (vs).

8.24. Nom. sg. -ā. As we found -*ū*, apparently m.c. for -*u* (= -*o*, -*as*), § 8.21, so too, and rather more frequently (as in Aśoka's language, with nouns and pronouns: Hultzsch lxiv *sā*; lxxvi etc., and in Ap., Tagare p. 27), -*ā* occurs as nom. sg., chiefly in verses where meter requires a long. Perhaps confusion with the nom. pl. is concerned; it appears that nom. sg. forms are used in the pl., see §§ 8.83, 84; or, as in some other case forms, confusion with (n. sg. of) fem. *ā*-stems. It seems to occur several times even in the prose of Mv, according to the mss.; *anuvirājitaśarīrā* (*aṣṭā*-) Mv i.38.14 where Senart em. °*śarīro*; *yuvarājā abhiṣiñcitavyā* i.51.5 (Senart em. °*tavyo*; is final -*ā* here mechanically carried over from *yuvarājā*?); *ayam evarūpo cetaso parivitarkā* (Senart em. °*ko*) *udapādi* i.51.9. The rest are all from verses: *apūrvadharmā śruṇitavyu adya, āścaryabhūto hi tathāgatānām* SP 308.11; the form °*dharmā* seems certainly sing.; three mss. °*dharma*, but this is unmetrical. — *asahāyu naro vrajate 'dvitiyo svakakarmaphalānugatā vivaśaḥ* LV 175.10 (all mss. °*gatā*; Calc. °*gato*); *kṣaṇā upasthitaḥ* 219.4 'the moment has arrived' (so all mss., this time kept in Calc., while Lefm. em. *kṣaṇo*). — LV 219.22 could be interpreted, with HJAS 1.69, as *anuttarā yo bhava* (= *abhavaḥ*) *rāga-sūdanaḥ*; but the Tib., which contains bar chad 'impediment', makes it probable that the true reading is *anantarāyo*. — *ko guṇā iha* Mv i.69.7 (so, or *guṇāḥ*, all mss.; Senart em. *guṇo*); -*kuśalā abhi*° i.122.6 (Senart em. -*kuśalo*); -*satvā iti* i.122.7 (Senart em. -*satvo*); *devasaṃghā k*- i.143.11 = 200.7 = ii.4.4 (Senart em. °*saṃgho* or °*saṃghaḥ* each time; mss. °*saṃghā*, v.l. first time °*gha*, or °*saṃghāḥ*; certainly nom. sg. is meant). — *yada niṣkramī sa dupadendrā* Gv 259.20 (so read) 'when that king retired from the world'; ed. *padaniṣkramī sadu padendrā* (!); *abhyudgatā jinu* 284.12 (can only be nom. sg.; name of a Buddha); *teṣa lābha paramā acintiyas* 488.5.—Also in pronouns: *saptarātra bhaṇamānu gopike sā viyūha napi śakya kṣepituṃ, yā viyūha abhu* . . . LV 237.13–14 (vs) 'tho described for a week, that pomp could not be exhausted, which pomp was . . .' *yā* is read by all mss. (except one which reads *svā*) and *sā* by all but two; however, there is a fem. *vyūhā*, Dict.; *yā* (for *ya* = *yas*) *icchatī* . . . LV 46.1 (vs, no v.l.).

8.25. Nom. sg. -e. The ending -*e* (§ 1.32 and fn. 11) seems to be rare, judging by the printed texts. However there are quite a number of cases in which the mss. of Mv show -*e*; but Senart always emends to -*o*; this time I have not taken the pains to collect many. The form *uttare* in SP 313.8, LV 364.18, etc. is probably an adverb; see Dict. *anyatra sūri* (so read with v.l. for ed. *bhūri*; nom. sg.) *bodhisattva* (nom. sg.) *brahmakalpasaṃnibhe* (no v.l.; can only be nom. sg.) LV 74.4 (vs). — *saṃpratijāte sugate* . . . *avatiṣṭhe*(*t*) Mv i.220.9 = ii.22.10 (vs), all mss. both times; Senart em. °*jāto sugato*; *narottame* ii.193.19 (vs), mss.; Senart em. °*mo*. — Pronouns (see also *se, te* § 21.7); *na me 'sti etādṛśa bhogu* (v.l. *bhāga, bhāgu*) *kecit* (v.l. *kiṃcit*) SP 115.2 (vs) 'I have not any such enjoyment (or share)'. See BSOS 8.514; but a plural seems improbable. Cf. also §§ 8.28, 37.

8.26. Nom. sg. -aṃ. In view of the very frequent interchange of masculine and neuter endings (§§ 6.1 ff.), the occurrence of nom. sg. forms in -*aṃ* from stems which are regularly masc. hardly calls for special comment here. But influence of the acc. sg. masc. is also conceivable. It may be viewed as 'change of gender', or better, as signalizing a tendency towards breakdown of the system of formal gender distinctions, especially as between masc. and nt. Yet I shall cite one specially curious case: *nāyaṃ mārgaṃ bodhāya* Mv ii.130.13 (prose) 'this is not the path to enlightenment'. So Senart with all mss. Note the masc. pronoun *ayaṃ*; to be sure we find *ayam* for *idam*, nt. (§ 21.82); but would it be realistic to speak of 'change of gender' here? The word *mārga* (*magga*) seems to be recorded only as masc. in Skt. and MIndic. Could the ending (*mārg*)-*aṃ* have been mechanically carried over from the modifying pronoun (*ay*)-*aṃ*?

Vocative singular

8.27. Voc. sg. -ā. Very common is the ending -*ā*, which is not recorded in Pali but is general Prakrit and is explained by Pischel (71) as due to pluti. Tho rare in prose (once in Divy mss.; otherwise no prose case noted outside of Mv, and few there), it is fairly frequent in positions where meter does not demand lengthening, notably at the end of lines or pādas in which short final vowels are otherwise frequent, as in all the verses of SP. The following examples, except those marked as prose, are all from verses, but none of them can properly be described as having -*ā* metri causa. (See HJAS 1.70 for *mārṣā* in the prose of LV, erroneously taken as voc. sg. by Weller 44.) *jināna uttamā* SP 36.9; *śatapuṇyalakṣaṇā* 162.12. — *nāthā* LV 12.10; in 234.11 ff., a long series of vocatives, nearly all in -*ā*, and many at the ends of lines, in Gopā's apostrophe to the departed Bodhisattva. — *jinasutā* Mv i.76.9; *mahāyaśā* 77.4 and 187.10; *naravarātmajā* 84.13; *jinaputrā* 126.6 (prose); -*saṃnikāśā* 156.19; *puruṣādhamā* 185.10; *māṇavā* ii.92.22 (v.l. °*vaḥ*, but voc.); *vānararājā* (so mss., Senart em. °*ja*) 108.14 (prose); *chandakā* 165.14 (prose; here kept in ed.); *acintiyā* 296.4; *putrakā* iii.8.14; *vīrā* 124.5. — *mahārājā* (ed. em. °*ja*) Divy 387.28 (prose). — RP (many cases) *nāyakā* RP 5.15 and 9.12; *pāramiṃgatā* 5.16; *narottamā* 6.2 and 8.15; -*vikramā* 7.5; -*dāyakā*,

dāntamānasā 7.11; others 8.16; 9.5, 9, 10, 12, etc.; in 50.9 ff. a long list, addressed to a Buddha, many at the ends of lines or pādas. — Gv (frequent) *-maṇḍalā* Gv 54.13; *udāgatā* 54.14; *saṃbhṛtā* 54.15; *purojavā* 54.16; *sudhīrā* 230.14; *suviśuddhanetrā* 334.14; etc.

8.28. Voc. sg. -o, -u, -e. Furthermore, we find occasionally nom. sg. endings (*-o*, *-u*, perhaps *-e*) used as voc., at least according to the mss. Generally the editors emend. Only in verses; illustrated here by a few samples only. Cases of *-o* could be classed with *-o* m.c. for final *-a*, §§ 3.79 ff. *sūru* or *śūru* LV 171.8 'O hero!', seems the true reading despite some variation in mss., and can hardly be anything but voc.; *sārathivare* 193.16 (vs) voc. acc. to Tib. and Foucaux; but perhaps loc. 'in (the company of) the excellent charioteer'; on *citritake* and *suśobhaṇake*, LV 321.21–22, either voc. sg. m. or nom. sg. nt., see Dict. s.v. *citritaka*. — (In HJAS 1.70, *sahāyakas* LV 235.7 was taken as voc.; but now I believe rather that the adjoining *bhartu* is nom. sg., and that *sahāyakas* agrees with it: 'your companion, my husband.') — *śiriprabho* Mv ii.235.5 (mss.; Senart em. °*bhā*; voc. of °*prabha*). — *sudhano* Gv 208.17 (can only be voc. of *sudhana*); *sthiro* (= *sthira* in prec. line; but 2d ed. *sthirā*) Gv 412.16.

Accusative sg. masc. and nom.-acc. sg. nt.

8.29. These forms can be grouped together, since they are identical in our dialect as in Sanskrit. The classical forms, *-am* or *-aṃ*, are very common, but in verses are not differentiated as in Skt.; the ending with anusvāra occurs quite standardly even before vowels for metrical reasons (when a long syllable is required), and *-am* only when the syllable is short. In absolutely final position the mss. regularly show *-aṃ*; but many mss. of standard Skt. works regularly write anusvāra for final *m*. This in itself, therefore, cannot be regarded as conclusive evidence that in our dialect final *-am* regularly became *-aṃ*, altho it can scarcely be doubted that it did (as in all MIndic).

8.30. The ending -u is common in the verses of most texts. It has not been noted in prose; and seems hardly to occur in Mv, where it is much rarer even than the same ending in the nom. sg. masc. One might be tempted to take it as a nom. (masc.) form used as acc., and then transferred to the nt. But *-u* is also found for any other final *-am* (e. g. *ahu* for *aham*; § 3.58). Hence, with Pischel 351, and H. L. Dschi, § 1.97, we must probably consider it a phonetic development of *-am*, *-aṃ*. Apparently it is used only m.c.: *āśayu* SP 62.14; *jñānu* 93.10; *dharmu* 93.12; etc., common. — *buddhakāryu kṛtu* LV 48.13; *dānu dattu* 53.1; *viṣādu* 91.17; *naru* 168.16; etc., common. — *aśavahu brahmacaryaṃ* Mv ii.299.14 (vs); so mss.; Senart em. *aśabala-brah*°. This is the only case I have found in my records from Mv, but it may be that I have overlooked some. — *śāsamānu* RP 7.12; *avasthānu* 18.9; *hāsyu* 28.3; *pramāṇu* 54.22, etc. — *abhāvu* Samādh 8.22 and 23; *kṛtu* 8.22; *āśayu* 8.28; *kālu*, *ciru* 19.24; *dṛṣṭu* 19.27; *pravartitu* 19.30; *dukhu* 19.32; *cittu* 22.26; *nirdeśu* 22.35, 37; etc., very common. — *pāpu* Bhad 8; *cakru anuttaru* 10; *saṃcitu* 12 and 61; *nityu* 16; *pramāṇu* 45; *agru* 48; *kṣipru* 49, 51, 53; *sujīvitu* 50; *māru sasainyaku* 53. — *-dvāru* Gv 55.2; *-jñānu* 122.14. — *anantu* Sukh 7.14. — Pronouns: *etu* SP 57.7; 97.4; 113.1; LV 287.12; *imu* Samādh 8.28; 19.27, 29.

8.31. The ending -a is, in most texts, commoner than the preceding. It is practically limited to verses; there are a very few prose cases in LV and fewer yet in Mv. There are, to be sure, a few other cases which, tho occurring in verses, are in metrically indifferent positions, so that they cannot be said to be metrically demanded.

8.32. The prose cases are as follows: *dharma deśitam* LV 404.10 and 19, printed by Lefm. as one word; Calc. and one ms. *dharmaṃ de*° in line 19; *vitāna samalaṃkṛtaṃ*, *gaganatala samalaṃkṛtam* 413.4; and *dharmacakra pravartayatu* . . . 413.6–7. Certainly *dharmacakra*, and pretty surely *vitāna* and *gaganatala*, must be independent noun forms, not compounded with the following words as in Lefm. In 380.4 Weller 36 would read *sukha* as a separate word (text *kadācit sukhaprāptaṃ pūrvaṃ*); I suspect the true reading is *sukhaṃ prāptapūrvaṃ* (misplacement of anusvāra in text). In LV 19.12 Weller 18 wrongly takes *jāti*, *jarā*, *vyādhi*, and *maraṇa* as separate nouns; *jātiprajñāyate* etc. are denominative verbs ('there is, arises, consciousness-of-birth', *jātiprajñā*, etc.). — *ṛddhiprātihārya* (so mss., Senart em. °*yaṃ*) *dṛṣṭvā* Mv i.266.17.

8.33. I have noted the following cases in verses where meter does not demand a short syllable: *ātmabhāva prabhāsvaram* SP 237.9; *vīrya* 254.3, according to ed. with Nep. mss.; but Kashgar version, La Vallée-Poussin JRAS 1911, 1073, rearranges the order in such a way that *vīrya* is metrically required. — *nadikūla ivā savālukaṃ* LV 175.22 'like a sandy river-bank'; the adjective *savālukaṃ* proves that *-kūla* has its usual neuter gender; but *-kūlam ivā* would be metrically just as good (even better, as avoiding hiatus); *saukhya agra*° 76.6, as prec., but here Calc. *saukhyam*, and v.l. °*yaṃ* (unmetr.). — *ādīnava* Mv i.184.14, all mss.; Senart em. °*vaṃ*; metr. indifferent; *meruśṛṅga a-* ii.404.7 (as in LV 175.22, above).

8.34. In the rest meter favors or demands a short syllable: *śarīra* SP 26.8; *dharma* 177.3, 236.14; *jñāna* 302.6; etc., common. — *apuṇya* LV 42.11; *sukha* 42.15; *sugata* 46.9; *-rasa* (divide here) 165.6; etc., common.—In Mv Senart often lets the form in *-a* stand, but about equally often emends to *-aṃ*, contrary to metrical requirements; I mark with an asterisk the cases in which Senart reads *-aṃ* unmetrically; in practically all of these he has emended, tho a few times there is a v.l. supporting him. In Mv i.47.6 = i.81.15, read: (*mānasaṃ*) *jñānasāgar' avatāra nāyakā(ḥ)*, 'a mind that penetrates (plunges; or, if causative, immerses) into the ocean of knowledge'. Further, *-kāṣṭha* i.68.19; *suparigīta* (or, with most mss., °*ṇīta*) 70.6; *yācanaka* 84.6; *samupacita* 120.3; read *vighna* 156.7 with v.l. (m.c.); *anantara* 204.6 = ii.8.1* (adverb; note that Senart emends the second passage but keeps the mss. reading in the first, tho the two are identical); *ādīnava* i.359.6; *ṛṣivara* ii.53.19; *pratirūpa* 92.22*; *duḥkha* 93.16*; *putra* 133.15; 134.16; *phala* 134.4*; *kuśala* 220.14*; *bhṛṅgāra* 299.10*; *ekāṃśa* 320.15*; *-sahasra* 322.4*; *sphuṭa* 327.6, 7; *nidhāna* 334.2*; *vimāna* 334.10*; *prāsāda* 334.18*; *ruta* 337.9*; *sphuṭa* 344.1; *citta* 368.8*; *utpīḍa* 370.5; *dharma* 371.13, 17; *aparimita* (separate word) 373.2; *saṃgha* 373.3; *paiśunya* 384.8; *gṛhīta* 396.13; *prācīna* iii.386.12. — *trisahasra* Samādh 8.22; *adhyavasāna* 22.4, 6; etc. (seems less common than *-u* here). — *kāya* Suv 18.4 (so read with v.l., text *kāyaṃ*, unmetr.); *sarva* 24.8 (so read with v.l. for impossible *sarvi*; acc. sg. nt.); *nitya* 37.17 and 39.18; *dharma* 42.11; *kṣetra* 52.2; *saṃmukha* 52.5; etc., common. — *dharma* RP 5.11; *rāgadoṣaja* 6.3; *jihma* 6.15 (separate word); *maitra* . . . *śīla* 7.13; *mārga* . . . *kṣema* 7.16; *śāṭhya* 10.11; *dharma śreṣṭha* 11.7; etc., common. — *puṇya* Bhad 9; *praṇidhāna* 23 and 61; *vibudhyana*, *darśana* 35; *viśiṣṭa* 48; etc., common. — Pronouns: *ta buddhakṣetram* SP 149.14; *eta* SP 93.4, 7; Mv i.72.18.

8.35. The entire ending may be lost or fused with a following vowel: *vīry' ārabhanti* (for *vīryam ā*°) Dbh.g. 8(344).4.

8.36. The nom. sg. masc. ending -o seems to occur also in acc. sg. and nom.-acc. sg. nt. forms, at least in LV: *ko 'tra javi ti vismayo janeyā* . . . *karotha gauravo 'smin* LV 152.6 (vs) 'who here would make astonishment (be astonished) that he is swift? . . . pay respect to him!'; were it not for *gauravo*, which seems to confirm *vismayo* as acc., we might take *ko* . . . *vismayo* as nom. and *janeyā*

as a syncopated opt. passive (cf. Pkt. *vejja, lahejja, acchejja*, Pischel 535), 'what astonishment would be produced?' Tib. seems to have had a quite different text; *naiṣkramyaśabdo 'nuvicārayanti* LV 219.18 (vs) 'meditate on the word (sound) of (the Bodhisattva's) departure from the world'; Calc. *śabdā* but all mss. *śabdo*; see Dict. s.v. *anuvicārayati*; *na ca mana* (so all mss. in 165.16, but in repetitions *manu*) *kṣubhito* LV 165.16 (vs, end of line); repeated 166.1, 6, etc.; *nagaraṃ vyākulu bhītatrastamānaso* LV 193.10 (vs) 'the city was perturbed, with mind frightened and alarmed.'

8.37. The ending -e may possibly be used as nom. sg. nt. in *citritake* and *suśobhanake*, LV 321.21–22; see Dict. s.v. *citritaka*. But they could also be voc. sg. m., § 8.28.

8.38. Acc. sg. masc.-nt. -ā, -āṃ. In HJAS 1.72, I cited *svargāmṛtadvāram uttamāṃ* LV 178.8 (vs), very dubiously, as a masc. acc. sg. with the fem. ending *-āṃ*, read by all mss. and Lefm., only Calc. *uttamaṃ*, which I there found it hard to doubt was the true reading. Now I am less sure. Not only have I discovered many masc. and nt. forms used in the fem. *ā* declension (q.v.); but also a few other clearly masc. or nt. forms in *-ā* or *-āṃ*, acc. sg., have showed up (and cf. *-ā* in the nom. sg.). It may be that these were actually used by our authors occasionally, and signalize the beginning of a breakdown between masc., nt., and fem. forms; cf. §§ 6.1 ff. *vilumpatha imāṃ* LV 335.13 (vs) 'despoil him (the Bodhisattva)!' All mss. are said to read *imāṃ*, and even Calc. has *imā*, glossing *imaṃ*; *tāv api ca balīvardhau . . . śakaṭā prakarṣitau* LV 382.1 (prose) 'those two bulls drew (§ 34.15) the cart'. Certainly *śakaṭā* cannot be abl. There is no v.l. in Lefm., but Foucaux, Notes 196, cites v.l. °*ṭān*. It is true that more than one cart was concerned in the story (five according to 385.14), so that conceivably *śakaṭā* is meant as plural; this is not disproved by Tib.'s rendering *śiṅ rta*, without specifically plural suffix. But would the text speak of a pair of bulls drawing (all) 'the carts'? — *-asatpuruṣā* Mv i.132.1 (prose), acc. sg., all mss.; Senart em. °*ṣaṃ*.

Instrumental singular

8.39. Inst. sg. -enā, with lengthened final vowel, only m.c. in verses, common especially in LV. *-vareṇā* LV 57.21; *-cireṇā* 78.5; *vīryeṇā* 162.4; *-ratenā* 168.6.— Also in pronouns, e.g. *yenā* SP 53.2. In our language any final short vowel may be lengthened in verses m.c.; this is only one special case.

8.40. Inst. sg. -inā for -ena, as in Ap. *-iṇa* (Pischel 363; Jacobi, Bhav. 33*, San. 12). Rare and probably only in verses m.c. in nouns; in fact only one instance has been noted. In pronouns and pronominal adjectives there are other cases, including some in prose: § 21.14. *mūrdhinā* Mv i.65.14 (vs), best understood as m.c. for *mūrdhena* = *mūrdhnā* (which has taken on *a*-stem endings). Senart takes the *i* for an epenthetic vowel and derives directly from *mūrdhnā*; but only *mūrdhanā* or *mūrdhnanā* are found in the mss. at Mv i.67.11 (vs), where Senart also reads *mūrdhinā*; while *a*-stem forms like *mūrdhena* are well established from *n*-stems.

8.41. Inst. sg. -asā, as in Pali (Geiger 79.1) and AMg. (Pischel 364). Not common; noted only in Mv, but there in prose. The two forms recorded are *balasā* and *padasā*, both found in Pali, and the former at least in AMg. *padasā* occurs Mv ii.199.8; iii.115.11; 437.17; 443.17 (all prose except the first), and *balasā* iii.169.7 (prose). — According to Kern, SP Preface p. viii, *balasā* is found in the Kashgar version of SP (Nep. *balātkāreṇa*). — Cf. the nt. nom-acc. pl. ending *-āṃsi*, § 8.105.

8.42. Inst. sg. -ayā and -āya, and perhaps *-ā*, fem. oblique forms, used as instr. masc., as conversely *-ena* is used in fem. *ā*-stems (§ 9.69). *pūrvapakṣayā* Laṅk 348.12, m.c.; °*pakṣeṇa* metrically impossible here. There is no stem **pakṣā*. — *prathamacittotpādāya āvṛtāni* Mv i.104.4 (prose) 'blocked by the first origination of the thought (to become a Bodhisattva).' The mg. is clear and inst. certainly required; there is no fem. stem **utpādā*. In the plural there is some formal confusion between the endings inst. *-ebhis* (*-ehi*) and dat. *-ebhyas* (or representatives), but this seems hardly related to that phenomenon.— Apparently ending *-ā*: *ūrṇapāśā* (v.l. *ūrṇakośā*), LV 357.9, see Dict. s.vv. *ūrṇā*(*kośa*).

8.43. Inst. sg. -a, stem-form, see § 8.8.

Dative singular

8.44. Dat. sg. -aya and -āyā occur sporadically in verses as purely m.c. variants of the regular *-āya*. *sarvasattvahitayābhiprasthita* Gv 54.18 (vs) (for °*hitāya* + *abhi*°).—*hitāyā* (for *hitāya*) Dbh.g. 51(77).3.

8.45. Dat. sg. -āye. Almost limited to the Mv, but not rare there in prose as well as verse, is this ending; occasionally but rarely written *-āyai* in the mss. See HJAS 1.73 for a few forms in LV interpreted by Weller (44) as showing the ending *-āyai*; I still think the LV evidence inconclusive. I find it hard to understand the form except as a borrowing of the ending of fem. *ā*-stems. The only reasonably clear case outside of Mv is: (*cārakagahanagatān sattvān*) *samāśvāsayām āsa, bandhanaṃ vipramokṣāye* Gv 353.19 (prose). If text is correct, the form can only be a dat. of purpose from *vipramokṣa*. Cf. 362.14 below, in the verse account of the same incident, *vipramokṣāya nṛpaṃ yayāce* 'asked the king to release them'. — *vipramokṣāye* Mv i.4.4 (prose); only one inferior ms. °*ya*; but in the next line *vipramokṣāya*; *tāye bodhāye* (Senart *bodhaye*) i.60.11 (prose); *bodhāye* 80.7 (prose; so Senart here with 2 mss., 3 mss. *bodhāya*; repeated several times in the sequel with similar variations); *bodhāye* also 120.5, 7 (prose); *samyaksaṃbodhāye praṇidhenti* 127.1 (prose), all mss.; in l. 3 below °*dhāya*; *ihāgamanāye* (Senart em. *iha ga*°) 226.3 = ii.29.6 (vs), all mss.; but parallel i.152.9 °*nāya* without v.l.; *arthāye* (= *arthāya*) with gen., 'for the sake of', i.233.11; ii.103.18; 158.12; 242.16; 251.1; 253.9 etc.; 425.16 (mostly prose); in cpd. *darśanārthāye* ii.35.19 (vs); *darśanāye vandanāye paryupāsanāye* (v.l. for each °*nāya*) i.320.2 (prose); *darśanāye . . . paryupāsanāye* repeated lines 4 and 6, without v.l.; *gamanāye* i.362.15 (prose), quasi-infinitive; same ii.101.1 (prose); in i.361.21 *gamanāya* in practically identical phrase; *samyagduḥkhakṣayāye* ii.119.5 (prose); same passage in LV 239.15 °*kṣayāya*; *jñānāye darśanāye saṃbodhāye* ii.121.7 (prose); repeated in the sequel; same passage in Pali, MN i.241.8, has forms in *-āya*; *abhinirvartanāye* 121.9; *prahāṇāye* 124.1; *darśanāye* 127.6 f.; 128.11 f.; 129.13 f.; 153.13; 156.5; 449.7; iii.57.5, 6; 407.8 (all prose); *alaṃ . . . gamanāye* ii.151.8; 153.3; 155.13 (all prose); *palāyanāye* 172.8 (prose); *piṇḍāye* (once v.l. °*āya*) 198.4; 200.15 (both vss); *mokṣāye* 204.9 (vs); *gamanāye* 233.16 (prose); *-jñānāye* 284.7 (prose); *dharṣaṇāye* 320.8 (vs); *-vijayāye* 399.14; 400.3 (both prose); *-vihārāye* iii.48.12 (prose); *-parichedāye* 48.13 (prose); *-hitāye* 124.14 (vs); *virāgāye, nirodhāye, śrāmaṇyāye, saṃbodhāye, nirvāṇāye* 331.5 (prose), repeated 8–9; *ekamekāye hastāye* 358.5 (prose); *anugrahāye* 374.9 (vs); *pralobhāye* 387.9 (vs).

Ablative singular

8.46. Abl. sg. -ā, MIndic for *-āt*, as in Pali, AMg., M., JM. Rare outside of Mv, but not at all uncommon there, in prose as well as verse. Meter, of course, cannot be concerned here, yet the few occurrences in other texts than Mv are almost entirely found in verses; there is only one rather doubtful prose occurrence: *manuṣyān-*

dhatvā jaḍā LV 19.19, for *manuṣyā(ḥ) andhatvāj jaḍā*, which Weller 18 would put into the text by emendation; in view of the following *j-* this is not impossible.

8.47. In verses I have noted: *anyatr' upāyā* SP 46.12 'except for a means'; *ajātatvā* 281.6 (Kashgar mss. °*tvād*); *merutalā 'nupātayed* 449.1.—*nānyatra iṣṭamadhurā* LV 42.19.—*nacirā* RP 38.4; *duṣpathā* 38.18.—*likhanā* Mmk 70.9; *darśanā* 70.10.

8.48. In Mv, however, the forms are common; the following list is far from exhaustive. Prose passages are marked as such: *kuṇapāto . . . narakotsadā* Mv i.7.3 (prose) 'from the subordinate hell *kuṇapa*'; *asipatravanā* 12.2; *karmapratyayā* 13.13; 16.5; *talā* 26.3 (prose); *jīvitā* 101.9; *adinnā* 145.9; *kāraṇā* 170.9; *vadanā* 171.5; 172.6.—In 204.7 = ii.8.2 the mss. readings, altogether, suggest to me (contrary to Senart) this text: *vātaṃ pi yeṣa calitaṃ śruṇiya krodhāt* (or *krodhā*, abl.) *samutpatati agnisamā*, 'of whom even the wind (breath), when they hear something move, flies up from (as a result of) their fire-like anger.'—*sukhasya ca prahāṇā duḥkhasya ca prahāṇāt* (!) i.228.8 and ii.132.4 (prose); *kāraṇā* i.244.6 (prose) and ii.232.6; *bādhā* (mss. *vādhā*) i.295.1 'from plague' (Senart em. badly); *-vāditā* 326.16 (prose); *uccaśayanā* 326.17 (prose); *uparikoṣṭhakā* 327.15, 16 (prose); *brahmakāyikā devanikāyā* (abl. with *yāvad*) 333.7 (prose); *priyā* 358.23; *vacanā* ii.102.18; 105.4; *hastināpurā* 112.14 (prose); *ekotibhāvā* 131.18 (prose); *puravarā* 134.9; *bandhanā* 181.21; *dānā* 183.19; *-samucchrayā* 197.2; *kulā* 199.17 (= Pali, same form, Sn 423); *nivāpā, kālapāśokāsā* (= °*pāśāvakāśāt*) 252.2 (prose); *gagaṇā* 404.4; *vijitā* iii.7.15; *-pratyayā* 65.13 ff. (prose); *āyurkṣayā* (v.l. *āyuḥ*°) 65.17; *karmakṣayā* 18; *manasikārā* 332.13 (= °*kārāt* 16); etc.

8.49. Abl. sg. -a, 'stem form'; here perhaps by metrical shortening of the preceding (*-ā* for Skt. *-āt*); has been noted only in verses; see § 8.9.

8.50. Abl. sg. -āta(ḥ), -āto, -ātu. The regular ending of most Prakrit dialects, where it appears as *-āo, -ādo*; representing *-ā(t)* + *tas*. Note that it is not recorded in Pali, which uses the pronominal ending *-asmā, -amhā*. Most texts show such forms only in verses. The Mv however uses them constantly in prose, and regularly in the form *-āto*, without regard to saṃdhi. Otherwise, in prose, I have noted only a series of compounds ending in *-grahāto*, Māy 220.13 ff., and repeated later in the same text.

8.51. The following are samples, a few out of many, from the Mv; all are taken from prose, tho many could also be cited from verses: *talāto* Mv i.6.11; *kukkulāto* 7.1; *kuṇapāto* 7.3; *kuḍḍāto* 25.14 ff. (repeatedly); *tamāto, apāyāto, vinipātāto* 27.8, 9; *akṛtapuṇyāto* 28.6–7; *-dāruṇāto mahāprapātāto* 34.8; *-madhyāto* 40.10; *devanikāyāto* 55.15; *dvīpāto* 158.13 (mss. vary, probably correct); *sukhāto . . . duḥkhāto . . . aśubhāto* etc. 173.3 ff., mingled with forms like *nityato* line 2 (in some cases mss. vary); *tuṣitabhavanāto* 196.21; 197.7, 10; *padminīvanāto udyānāto* 223.9–10; *-yojanāto* 231.14; *anuhimavantāto* 232.11; 284.11; *sakāśāto* 243.17; 245.16; 273.11; *adhiṣṭhānāto* 244.10; *sopārakāto* 245.3 (so read with mss.); *tuṇḍaturikāto parvatāto* 245.11; *bhadrakalpāto, dīpaṃkarāto* 248.6; *sudarśanāto nagarāto* 262.2, 3; *amukāto* °*koṭṭarāto* (text °*koṭa*°) 273.15; *prāṇātipātāto prativirato* 326.14, followed by parallel formulas with ablatives some in *-āto*, some in standard *-āt*.

8.52. Otherwise *-āto* (*ātaḥ, -āta, -ātu*) occurs only in verses. We should expect *-āta, -ātu* to occur only where the meter demands a short syllable; but strange to say this is not universally the case. The various forms seem to be used interchangeably in such texts as SP and LV when the meter is indifferent, and also independently of saṃdhi; the initial of the following word has no bearing. Examples: *asaṅgajñānātu acintiyātaḥ* SP 62.6; *traidhātukāto bhayabhairavātaḥ* (Kashgar mss. °*tu*) 91.10; *amukātu nagarātu* 115.8; *sadevakāto* (end of line; so Nep. mss., except one *sadevalokato*, which is also metrically sound; Kashgar mss. *sadevakātu*; ed. em. °*kātaḥ*, without reason), *lokāt samārātu sabrahmakātaḥ* (Kashgar mss., by lect. fac., *samārāc ca sabrahmakāc ca*) *sarveṣa sattvāna ca antikātaḥ* (Kashgar mss. °*kātu*) 119.2–3. — *nabhātu* LV 194.11; *sthānātu* 194.22; *saṃskṛtātaḥ* 195.12; 196.2; *śayāto* 230.11; *puravarāto* 235.10. — *mārapathāto* Bhad 20. — *-balātaḥ* Śikṣ 3.17; 4.1. — *-maṇḍalātaḥ* Sukh 51.13.

8.53. Abl. sg. -ato, -atu, with short *a* in the penult, also occurs, in the form *-ato*, in prose in the Mv. In this form it might be considered a standard Skt. form (Whitney 1098b), or not a great deviation from standard Skt., which however would hardly tolerate such phrases as *ābhāsvarād devanikāyato* Mv i.52.6–7 (prose); *yāvad abhiniṣkramaṇato* i.157.15 (prose). Moreover Mv prose passages present *-ato* forms mixed with those in *-āto*: *śuddhāvāsato devanikāyāto* i.55.15; *nityato* i.173.2, and others like it, parallel with *sukhāto* and other forms in *-āto*.

8.54. Not mingled with *-āto* forms, but with definitely local-ablative (not loosely adverbial) sense ('from', or 'as a result of'): *vipākato* Mv i.16.11; *-kṣayato* 267.9; *grāmato* (v.l. *-āto*) 301.8. And others in prose.

8.55. Outside of Mv such forms have been noted only in verses and m.c.: *naciratu* LV 230.14; *nacirato* 237.10. — *kāyatu* Suv 49.22; *rājakulato* 232.4; *nagaravarato* 232.6 (mss. °*purato*). — *puṇyatu, jñānatu* RP 4.4. — *kāyatu* Bhad 1, 8, 23, 43; *rāgatu dveṣatu* 8; *karmatu kleśatu* 20, 46; *cetanato* 23; *jñānatu rūpatu, varṇatu gotratu* 52. And *-ata*, in verses m.c.: *aśeṣata dharmata* Bhad 3 (separate word; *aśeṣata* often in Bhad, e. g. 46); *asaṅgata* 10.

8.56. Abl. sg. -atta (for -attaḥ), equivalent to *-āta(ḥ)* above? (Cf. the abl. ending *-atto* cited by Pkt. grammarians, Pischel 365, end.) Possibly in LV 329.13 (vs), where the mss. readings seem to suggest original *lajji hirotrapatta* (abl.), 'being ashamed, thru modesty and bashfulness' . . . The abl. construction seems confirmed by Tib. ṅo tsha skyeṅs nas (a cpd. abl. gerund) 'from being shame-embarrassed'.

8.57. Abl. sg. -asmā, the pronominal ending, as in Pali; only in Mv i.104.8 (prose), where for text *agārasthā anagāriyaṃ pravrajanti* we must certainly read *agārasmā*, the regular Pali form used in this formula. The usual BHS form is *agārād* (also, in Mv, *agārasya, agārāto*, etc.).

Genitive singular

8.58. Aside from the 'stem-form' in bare *-a* (above, § 8.10), I have noted only an occasional lengthening of the final *a* of *-asya*, in verses, m.c., as *nṛpasyā* LV 80.14; *ratanasyā iva* (probably read *iha*) . . . *yasyā* (for *yasya*) 109.8; *yasyā* also 111.10; 113.17 etc.; *tasyā* SP 96.8; LV 111.11; 193.16; Mv i.113.2 (so most mss., required by meter; Senart *tasya*; in i.156.10 meter also requires *tasyā*, Senart keeps *tasya* of mss.); Divy 591.23; *asyā* LV 152.5. —The isolated *maraṇāya* (v.l. °*ṇāye*), gen., Mv i.165.8, has been noted in § 6.10, as perhaps a case of change of gender, f. for nt.

Locative singular (for locs. in *-a* see § 8.11)

8.59. Loc. sg. -i for *-e* (only in Ap. acc. to Pischel 366a, end) is common in verses of most texts, almost invariably m.c., that is in positions where meter demands a short syllable. It occurs only very rarely in metrically indifferent situations like SP 341.7 *kṣayakāli ca deśayet* (second half of śloka line). Occasionally, however, *-e* is written, according to mss. and editions, even where meter demands a short. We then must doubtless recognize a short *-e* (§ 3.64). On the other hand, at least once, Gv 253.5, a text presents *-ī* (*lokī*) in what appears to be a

loc. sg., as if *-i* were lengthened m.c. to *-ī*! But the meter of this line is troublesome and doubtful.

8.60. Examples of *-i* in verses m.c.: *loki* SP 64.6; 85.14; 92.12; 93.13; *saddharmi* 69.1; *ākāśi* 87.12; etc., common.—*prāsādi dharmoccayi* . . . *siṃhāsani* LV 27.17; *tribhavi* 46.1; *modi prāpta* 53.16 (so, separate words); etc., common.—In Mv rare, as Senart says in notes on i.42.16, 70.11; *deśi* i.70.11; *loki* 105.1; *mūli* ii.8.11 (parallel i.204.16 mss. *mūla*); *loki* ii.92.10 (v.l. *loka*); *supini* 134.11, 12; *nabhi* 344.5; *avikali* 346.4. — *kalpi* Samādh 8.21; *-kandari śānti* 19.35; *-pūtiki kāyi aśāśvati, jīviti* 22.4; etc., common. — *loki* Suv 40.8; 54.4; etc., common. — *śili* RP 11.17; *parityāgi* 12.12; *jñāni* 20.3; etc., common.— *-agri* Bhad 3, 28; *kṣetri* 28; etc., common. — *ekaromi* Gv 34.5, 7, 9; 241.13; *ekakṣetri* 34.11, 18. — *arthi* Dbh.g. 7(343).25. — *loki* Sukh 7.17. — *kāle tathotsāhi kṛtaṃ ca dānam* Divy 405.8 (rare in this text). I take it that this stands for *-utsāhe*, coordinate with *kāle*. Less plausible would be a nom. sg. nt. of *-utsāhin*; the position of *ca* is against it, as well as other considerations. — *triloki* Sādh 16.1 (rare).

8.61. Loc. sg. -aṃhi, straight MIndic (from pronominal Skt. *-asmin*), = Pali *-amhi* (cf. Pkt. *-ammi*). Noted only once in a noun or adjective: *nikhilaṃhi loke* KP 129.7 (vs) 'in the entire world'. The same ending occurs with pronouns (*taṃhi, imaṃhi*, §§ 21.21, 66).

8.62. Loc. sg. -aṃse, also a MIndic form of pronominal Skt. *-asmin*; cf. *-aṃsi*, the usual AMg. ending. Noted only once, in the reading of the mss. at Mv i.268.4 (vs, end of first half of śloka line) *stūpaṃse* (emended by Senart to *stūpasmiṃ*).

8.63. Loc. sg. -asmin, -asmiṃ, -asmi. The pronominal ending of Skt. transferred to nouns, as in Pali *-asmiṃ* (*-amhi*; AMg. *-aṃsi, -ammi*). Occurs commonly in verses of most texts, also in the prose of Mv (but nowhere else as far as I have noted). But some texts, whose verses are in general normal BHS, do not show this ending frequently; thus it is absent from Bhad, and rare in Gv. Everywhere where *-asmin* etc. occur, the mss. present *-esmin, -esmiṃ, -esmi* about equally often; in the critical apparatus of such editions as furnish any, there is often, perhaps usually, variation in the mss. between *-asmin* etc. and *-esmin* etc. (see § 8.70). The writing of final *-n* or *-ṃ* is doubtless to be regarded as purely orthographic and immaterial; scribes who wrote *-n* no doubt did so under the influence of Sanskrit conventions. Once, at least, a text probably contained *-m* before an initial vowel (Mv i.207.14, vs, *supinasmim asyā*, read *asya* with mss. as in ii.12.4 and 18; Senart with v.l. °*smiṃ*, which is metrically bad).

8.64. Forms in *-asmi* (as also in *-esmi*), without final nasal, usually occur only where meter requires a short. No sure occurrence has been noted in the prose of Mv, the only text where *-smi(n, -ṃ)* forms have been recorded in prose. Nevertheless there are a few cases where the editions or mss. present nasal-less forms in *-smi* in metrically indifferent positions—at the end of lines or pādas, or for example in the first part of anuṣṭubh pādas where *-smin* would be metrically just as good. Examples of such metrically indifferent occurrences are: *śāsanesmi* Mmk 97.23; *pathasmi* Samādh 19.17. In Mv ii.462.17, a prose passage, Senart prints *grāmasmi*, but one of his two mss. reads *grāmesmiṃ* (or *grāme 'smiṃ*), which is probably to be adopted.

8.65. Examples of *-smi* where meter favors a short: *yāmasmi* SP 25.14; *dvārasmi* 86.4; *hastasmi* 147.12; *kāṭasmi* 254.13; 255.12; 273.5 (in all three of these the Kashgar fragments, La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911. 1073, 1076, support *kālesmi*, which is reported from one Nep. ms. in the first two passages).—*gṛhavarasmi* LV 50.9 (2 mss. *-esmi*); *gaganatalasmi* 50.10; *puravarasmi* 54.9.—*svargakāyasmi* Mv ii.193.7 (v.l. *-esmiṃ*, unmetr.); *jambudvīpasmi* 366.3 (v.l. as preceding); *lokasmi* 367.8; *drumavarasmi* 407.19 (v.l. *-asmiṃ*, unmetr.).

8.66. In the following metrical passages of Mv, Senart emends to *-asmi*, but *-esmi* must be read; meter requires short final: *buddhakṣetresmi* ii.350.4; *svakārthesmi* 409.20; *gaṅgātīresmi* iii.186.15. And others like these. — *-raṇasmi* Gv 54.20. — *kālasmi* Samādh 8.31 (2 mss. *-esmi*); *bodhivaṭasmi* 22.5 (1 ms. *-esmi*); *nāmarūpasmi* 22.26, 27 (here the meter is obscure to me).

8.67. Pronominal forms in *-asmi* also occur, but have been noted only in vss where meter opposes the regular *-asmin*. So *tasmi* SP 68.12; 87.5; LV 75.20; Mv ii.388.3; *yasmi* LV 75.5; *sarvasmi* Mv i.166.12; *svasmi* Samādh 19.26; *imasmi* SP 116.8; 359.9; *asmi* (*'smi* after *e, o*) SP 31.4 (but prob. read *lokesmi* with WT); 44.11; 64.5; LV 50.14; 360.13.

8.68. Forms in *-asmin* or *-asmiṃ* (which, as purely orthographic variants, can be grouped together) are common in the verses of most texts, and not rare in the prose of Mv. Very often, when the editors quote ms. readings, it turns out that some or all of them read *-esmin* or *-esmiṃ*; see § 8.70. In the following examples, there is at least reasonable prima facie ground for accepting the *-asmin* or *-asmiṃ* form. *aṣṭāpadasmiṃ* SP 146.3; *nirvṛtasmin* 253.15. — *nabhatalasmin* Gv 255.8. — *antikasmiṃ* Sukh 53.7. — *pratāpasmiṃ* Mv i.6.13 (prose); *pretasmiṃ* 29.3; *kalpasmiṃ ito asaṃkhyeye* 48.15 (prose; note discordance of endings, and cf. *kalpe* in line 17); *paralokasmiṃ* 184.10; *naravṛṣabhasmiṃ* 237.4; *anavarāgrasmiṃ* 282.6; *grāmasmiṃ* 304.3, 10; *osarasmiṃ* 361.20 (prose); *arthakaraṇasmiṃ* 364.5 (prose); *nyagrodhasmiṃ* 366.2; *vindhyasmiṃ* ii.37.14; *lokasmiṃ* 35.3, etc.

8.69. As a sample of the confusion regarding these endings as presented in the mss., note Mv (prose) i.312.8 *prathamasmiṃ* (v.l. °*esmiṃ*) *divasasmiṃ*, but id. 10 *dvitīyesmiṃ* (so mss., Senart em. °*asmiṃ*), 11 *tṛtīyasmiṃ divasasmiṃ* (no v.l.), 11–12 *caturthasmiṃ* (v.l. °*esmiṃ*) *divase*.

8.70. Loc. sg. -esmiṃ, -esmin, -esmi. There are however many cases where the prima facie evidence is equally strong for *-esmiṃ, -esmin* (or *-esmi*, see § 8.66). This ending was never definitely recognized as a form of our dialect until HJAS 1.74 f. Senart (Mv Introduction i p. xvii) systematically excluded it from the text of Mv despite its very common occurrence in his mss., and altho he noted its occurrence in LV also. To be sure the Calc. edition of LV usually prints *-e 'smin*, as if the pronoun *asmin* were present, rather than a case-ending. This is often done in other printed texts. E. g. SP 114.2, printed *palikuñcike 'smin*; but note 10 recommends emending to °*kuñcikasmin*. Nobel, in his ed. of Suv, e. g. on 142.7 (printed *viṣayasmin*), likewise assumes that the v.l. *viṣayesmin* could only intend *viṣaye 'smin*. As recently as 1938, Régamey in his ed. of Samādh (p. 17) says: 'As for the frequent endings *esmin*, I consider them, following Senart . . . as erroneous and awkwardly Sanskritized forms. I have corrected them into *asmin* in every case.'

8.71. It is true that *-esmin* or the like seems not to be recorded in any MIndic dialect. But it is easily explainable as a blend form of the regular Skt. *-e* with the MIndic (and Skt. pronominal) *-asmin*; and there can be no doubt that it was a genuine form of BHS. It is far too common to be emended out of existence. And there are very many cases where reading *-e 'smin* (for the pronoun *asmin*) is impossible.

8.72. It is very hard to dissociate the list of forms in *-esmin* etc. from those in *-asmin* etc., because, as stated above, when editors favor us with citations of readings from a number of mss., it is apt to appear that some of them read *a* and some *e* before *-smin* etc. This has been illustrated above, and will be further illustrated below.

It seems clear that both forms were extensively used in our language. The following samples are all cases where I think the evidence favors *-esmin* etc., and in many of them all mss. agree. All are from verses except those marked as prose; the latter are from Mv only. *caccaresmin* SP 88.1, so read, apparently with all Nep. mss. (the KN note seems to quote *cacaresmin*); Kashgar rec. *ca(c)care*, unmetrical; *tatra niveśanesmin* 114.13 (with Nep. mss.; ed. with Kashgar mss. °*asmin*; *tatra* makes pronoun *asmin* implausible); *anāsravesmin* 26.5; *bodhimaṇḍesmin* 30.16 (only Kashgar rec. °*asmin*); *sadevakesmin* 127.11 (with Nep. mss.; Kashgar rec. °*kasya*; KN em. °*kasmin*). — *ekarathavaresmin* LV 80.9; *gagaṇesmin* 81.3; *kṣitītalesmin* 153.10 (so all mss. but one, end of line; text °*smi*); *dharaṇītalesmiṃ* 194.15; *gehesmin* 201.12; *nabhesmin* 233.16; *puresmin* 136.7; etc. In the last, one ms. has *purasmiṃ*; in most of the cases cited all mss. agree. — *yāme ca paścimesmiṃ* Mv i.4.9 (vs, printed as prose; all mss.); the mss. also obviously intend *madhyamakesmiṃ* in i.4.8 (prose); *saṃghātesmiṃ* 13.11 (with 5 mss., one °*tasmiṃ*); *rauravesmiṃ* 14.5 (with 5 mss., one °*vasmiṃ*); *tapanesmiṃ* 14.15; *ṛṣivadanesmiṃ* 43.15 (5 of 6 mss. end *-esmiṃ*; meter requires °*smi*); *gṛddhakūṭesmiṃ* 193.8; *vyākaraṇesmiṃ* 241.14; *paralokesmiṃ* 270.10; *lokesmiṃ* 281.5; *-śāsanesmiṃ* 293.6; *ṛṣivadanesmiṃ* 337.11; *anosaresmiṃ* 365.5 (prose); *śarīresmiṃ* ii.34.17; *hastināpuresmiṃ* 105.9; *sopānesmiṃ* 172.9 (prose); *udgatesmiṃ* 194.3; *dharaṇītalesmiṃ* 343.14; *yuddhesmiṃ* iii.20.13; *antarīkṣesmiṃ* 96.15; 100.16; *dhavitesmiṃ* 184.8 (prose); *dakṣiṇesmiṃ* 307.7 (= LV 389.6, same passage, same form); *paścimesmiṃ* 308.7 (Senart with v.l. °*asmiṃ*; = LV 390.4 where no ms. has °*asmiṃ*); *rājagṛhesmiṃ* 440.4. — *mahāvanavaresmin* Suv 226.11; Nobel reads °*vare 'smin*, but the pronoun is implausible (cf. preceding *tatra*); *tatra mahāvanesmin* 236.6 (Nobel °*ne 'smin*). — *grāmesmin* Śikṣ 46.9; Bendall interprets as *grāme 'smin* 'in *yon* village', which seems to me nonsense in the context; occurs in a passage giving purely general vows of Bodhisattvas; *-śāsanesmin* 305.3, ms.; corresponds to Mv ii.388.1, where *śāsanasya* is read; *gaganesmin* 345.14, ms. (ed. em. *gaganasmin*; pronoun *(a)smin* quite impossible). — *bhojanesmiṃ* Mmk 104.7, *bhaktesmiṃ* 9. (Such forms seem to be rare in Mmk.)

8.73. Some forms in *-esmi* have been quoted above under *-asmi* (§§ 8.66). They do not certainly occur in prose, even that of Mv; and usually, at any rate, meter demands a short final syllable. Other examples are: *buddhakṣetresmi* Mv ii.350.4; *svakārthesmi* 409.20; *gaṅgātīresmi* iii.186.15. — *lokesmi* KP 38.6; printed *loke smi*, but *(a)smi(n)* is scarcely possible here, and is certainly not represented in Tib. — *śāsaṇesmi* Mmk 97.23. I believe *kālesmi* is probably to be read in SP 254.13, 255.12, and 273.5, rather than *kālasmi* of ed.; in the first two a v.l. *kālesmi* is quoted (from only one ms. to be sure; but the critical apparatus of KN is notoriously unreliable), and the Kashgar fragment quoted by La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1911.1073, 1076, reads *kālesmi* all three times.

Nominative-accusative dual masculine

8.74. Nom.-acc. dual -o (?). Occasionally the mss. of Mv show forms in *-o*, possibly standing for *-au*, dual. Senart regularly emends to *-ā* (plural); and indeed plurals generally prevail, for duals, in the context. E. g. *vayam* (referring to a pair of persons) *etasya agraśrāvako* (all six mss.; Senart em. °*kā*) *bhaveyāma* Mv i.44.8 (prose).

8.75. Nom.-acc. dual -u, m.c. for -au (-o). Rare; I have recorded only: *antu* Samādh 19.32 (vs) = *antau*, 'two extremes'; here clearly m.c.; but there is a variant *anta*; note modifying pronouns *ubhe eti* (= *ete*), dual neuter (or acc. pl. masc.? see § 8.77); and *ye imu dāraka dvau mama putrau* Suv 52.7 (vs); also m.c. but the majority of mss. *ima* (see next).

8.76. Nom.-acc. dual -a. A few times *-a* occurs in verses, referring to pairs, and associated closely with dual forms. See Suv 52.7, just quoted, with *dāraka* (and possibly *ima* instead of *imu*?). Also: *candrāsūrya nabhātu bhūmi patitau sajyotiṣālaṃkṛtau* (the two participles modify *candrāsūrya*) LV 194.11 (vs); *hastau chinna tathaiva chinna caraṇau* 194.13 (vs). Obviously meter requires a short final syllable in these forms. In HJAS 1.75 f. I have taken them as metrical shortenings of *-ā*, the plural form used for dual. Certainly it would be an error to connect them with the old Vedic dual ending *-ā*. There is considerable use of plural forms for dual, and mingling of both in the same passage, in our dialect.

Nominative-accusative dual neuter

8.77. -i for -e: *eti*, m.c. for *ete*, occurs Samādh 19.32 *antu* (v.l. *anta*) *ubhe api eti jahitvā*, cf. § 8.75. The parallel *ubhe* suggests that it is dual. But since plural forms are often associated with duals, it might be interpreted as acc. pl. (masc.).

Nominative plural masculine

8.78. Nom. pl. -ā, without regard to the following sound, and even before a pause. The regular MIndic ending, very common in verses in most texts; also in prose, commonly in Mv and sporadically (but rarely) in some other texts. Most editors deal with this very inconsistently, sometimes allowing *-ā* to stand, but sometimes emending to whatever Skt. saṃdhi requires for theoretical *-ās*. Prose examples are marked as such. *-śrāvakā* SP 93.9; *durbalā* 95.9 (in these two ed. em. *-āḥ* against all mss.); *kāṇā* 95.6, *daridrakā* 9; *-kāyā* 97.12; *-gulmā* 127.2; *tṛptā* 222.12, *sukhitā* 13; *anarthikā* 273.11 (no case noted in prose). — *visarjitā sma* LV 67.22; *-pramukhā sva-* 159.17; *yathartukā prā-* 186.9; in fusion with following *a-*, *manuṣyāndhatvā* 19.19 (for °*ṣyā an*°); *pañcakāpi bhadra-* 408.22 (but here best mss. omit *api*); (all these from prose, where it is rare; the following are from verses) *-gandharvā* 11.19; *-opapetā* 29.4; *viśālaprajñā* 29.11; *iṣṭidārakā suduḥkhitā* (so divide) 74.15; etc. — Mv, very common in prose and verse: *parvatā prajvalitā ādīptā sajyotibhūtā* i.6.13 (prose; end of sentence); *kulalā ca gṛdhrā ca kākolūkā ca* 7.4 (prose); *paribubhukṣitā sma* 8.2 (prose); *duratikramā* 9.10; *-mrakṣitā* 12.1; *devā* 30.5 (prose); *deśitā* 73.13; *-ādhyāśayā* 77.6; *-sadṛśā* i.151.3 = ii.27.14; *koliyā śākiyā ca* iii.93.20; etc. — *buddhadharmāpy acintiyā* Divy (rare) 79.21 = 469.5 (vs; = °*dharmā apy acintyāḥ*). — RP (not in prose but common in vss, and usually, but not always, em. by Finot): *-mānasā* RP 10.10; *vimohitā* 10.17; *sthitā* 11.1; *prayuktā* 15.3; *svasutā* 21.15; *-parigṛddhā* 29.14; *utsadā* 35.11, etc. (in the 1st, 3d, 4th, and 5th emended in ed., not in the others). — *ramaṇiyā* Samādh 19.21, etc. — *etādṛśā* Suv 37.1; read *paṇavā* 40.1 (ed. em. °*vāḥ*); *acintiyā* 62.16.—Av, not uncommon in ms., usually but not consistently em. by Speyer; e. g. in a set of verses ii.136.10–137.8, he leaves *palikṛtā* (with a 'sic') 136.10 but adds visarga to *-śabdā* 137.1 and to *mandaghoṣakā* 137.3.

8.79. Nom. pl. -a, as in Ap.; mainly in verses m.c., metrical shortening of the preceding. Often the final vowel is fused with an initial vowel of the next word; it makes no difference whether we regard these forms as containing *-ā* or *-a*; e. g. *sattveha* SP 86.10, *etādṛśātra* SP 86.13. The editions frequently print forms in *-a* as if compounded with a following word, even when this is manifestly impossible. On the whole the mss. of most texts are pretty reliable in writing a short *-a* where meter requires it; but some are unreliable, and those of Mv especially present *-ā* not infrequently where *-a* must be

read (*mallā* i.66.4, read *malla*; *pratiṣṭhitā* 71.4, read °*ta*; *vighnakarāḥ* 156.20, Senart prints °*rā* but notes that it must be scanned °*ra*; etc.). However, some even of the best editors actually do violence to meter by emending to -*ā* where the mss. have correctly -*a*. Some such errors by Senart will be noted below. *vimukta* SP 92.9, *mukta* 10; *kālaka* 94.7; etc., very common. — *tṛpta* LV 37.3; *akṣaṇa apāya* (*śodhitāḥ*) 53.6; *nagna* 74.16; *jina* 164.21; etc., very common. — *lokanātha* Mv i.69.21; *anāgata* 70.1; *devasaṃgha* 72.20 (so read with 1 ms., the rest °*gho* or °*ghā*, Senart the latter); *skandha* 73.8 (so correctly all mss., Senart em. °*dhā*, unmetr.); *kāma* 73.13; *samartha* 155.16; *ye duṣṭacitta* i.204.9 = ii.8.4 (in the *first* passage only Senart em. °*cittā*, unmetr.); -*saṃgha* i.204.10 = ii.8.5 (in the *first* passage only, Senart em. °*gho*, unmetr.); *roṣaka* ii.52.22 (read as separate word); *lokapāla* 134.2; *devarāja* 135.1; *sattva* 333.18; 348.11; *aśva* 337.15; *hata* 342.16; *śreṣṭha* 375.21; *pūjita* 387.18; *prahṛṣṭa* 415.1 (mss., Senart em. °*ṭā*, unmetr.); *prasthita* iii.141.6; *sphuṭa* ii.350.15 = iii.274.17 (in the former passage *sphuṭā* is read, tho metr. inferior); *duḥśīla* ii.355.18 = iii.280.3 (here mss. thus both times, Senart wrongly em. °*lā* the first time only); and many others. — *brahmasvara* Suv 23.4; *sattva* 23.11, 15; *upapanna* 24.9; *nirbhaya* 39.6; etc., common. — *vilakṣaṇa* Samādh 19.16; -*gata*, *yamalokika deva* 19.17; *nara* 19.28, 31, 32; etc., common. — *buddhasuta* RP 5.10; *dharmakośadhara* 6.10; *bāla* 10.17; *dānta śānta* 11.2; etc., common. — *pūjita*, *atītaka* (Gv 544.7 °*ku*), *anāgata*, *pūrṇamanoratha* Bhad 13; *pariśuddha* 14; *pāpaka* 19; etc., common. — *śruṇamāna* Gv 34.18; *bodhisattva* 34.19, 57.17; *raśmimegha* 241.3; etc., common.

8.80. Nom. pl. -e, the pronominal ending, transferred to nouns. Not recorded in MIndic for the nom. (but regular in acc. pl.), and only rare and sporadic here. Chiefly in verses. Cf. next paragraph. *te saṃskāre na santi tattvataḥ* LV 176.13, 'these compounds do not exist in reality.' Cf. also *chidyanti aṅga-m-aṅge* 223.15, 'various limbs were cut off'; so (except *chidyanta*) Lefm. with his ms. A; the other mss. metrically impossible. While *aṅga* is regularly nt., we have here the masc. (pronominal) ending. — *atītārthe* Mv i.122.18 'having missed their aim'. So all mss.; Senart em. °*ādhve*. — *na te virājite* RP 6.16 'they are not resplendent.' Finot's note suggests reading *virājate* for *virājante*, which is unnecessary and implausible.

8.81. Nom. pl. -i, metrical shortening of the preceding. For the same form in nt. nom.-acc. see § 8.103, and in pronouns (*ti*, *eti*, *yi* etc.), see § 21.25: *kṣayāntadharmi sarvi bhāvu* LV 173.3, 7, 'all states of being have a nature that ends in destruction.' — *māṃ ca* (read *co* or *cā*, m.c.) *apaśyanti janenti tṛṣṇāṃ* SP 324.2 (vs); note suggests emending to *apaśyanta*, as nom. pl., 'and not seeing me, they generate ardent desire (for me).' But the form of all mss. may be kept, as nom. pl. pple. (cf. § 18.19) or even as finite verb, 'and they do not see me' (Renou, Gr. Scte. p. 175).

8.82. Nom. pl. -āyo, m.c. -āya, fem. nom. pl. ending transferred to masc.: *te ca tatra kukkule dahyamānāyo janā pradhāvanti* Mv i.6.16 (prose); *hetubalopagatāya mahātmā* Śikṣ 4.5, 6 (vs; cited from Ratnolkādhāraṇī). Can hardly be anything but nom. pl. masc., unless we emend.

8.83. Nom. pl. -aḥ, -o, nom. sg. ending used for nom. pl.; cf. next paragraph. Confusion between these two case forms results from the fact that both have come frequently to have the same ending -*a*, as in Ap. Sporadic, and chiefly in verses; also in the prose of Mv. *jarā ca vyādhi mṛtyu enti dāruṇo mahābhayā* LV 173.5, 'age, disease and death go on, cruel and terrible'; all mss. *dāruṇo*; Calc. *dāruṇā*; *ima evarūpās turiyebhi śabdaḥ* 183.11; so all mss. (Calc. *śabdāḥ*); the modifiers show that a plural is meant; *hā dhik priyair viyogo naṭaraṅgasvabhāvasaṃnibhā anityā* 235.16; here either *viyogo* must be pl. or the following two adjectives singular. — *nirmukto kukkulam avagāhiṣu* Mv i.11.1; so 3 mss.; two *nirmuktoḥ*, one °*taḥ*; none °*tāḥ* which is Senart's em.; *advārakā gharo* (all mss.; Senart em. *gharā*) *pratiyattā bhavanti* i.24.13 (prose); *tenānivartiyas* (3 mss. °*tayas*; Senart em. °*tiyās*) *teṣām adhyāśayā iti smṛtāḥ* i.87.12; *nirmito bhikṣuḥ* i.192.10, all mss.; certainly pl.; Senart em. °*tā bhikṣūḥ*; *ime* . . . *āśramo* (all mss.; Senart em. °*me*) *udake saṃcaranti* iii.150.13 (prose). — *atra bāla abudho vimohitā* RP 10.17. Or is *abudho* derived from the stem *abudh*, recorded in Upaniṣads? Not likely.

8.84. Nom. pl. -u, metrical shortening for preceding; once, however, if the text (Śikṣ 347.4) is right, not m.c., tho in a verse. — *bhāvu* (see § 8.81) LV 173.3, 7; no v.l.; *tyaktu tyāga* (so, separate) *dustyajā* 170.7; here ms. A *tyakta*, but below, 170.14, all have *tyaktu* (*dustyajā tvayā*). — *bhāṣitu dharma tena bahuprakārā vividhā anantāḥ* SP 192.3 (?); certainly nom. pl., but *bhāṣita* is the reading of the Kashgar rec. and one Nep. ms. — *jinu* Gv 34.11; can only be n. pl. — Śikṣ 347.4 (see Dict. s.v. *palāta*); if the reading is correct, *palātv asurendrāḥ* can only be for *palātu* (= *palātāḥ*) *asu*°. The form (with -*v* in saṃdhi) is so bizarre that I am inclined to emend to *palāt'* (for °*tāḥ*) *asu*°.

8.85. Nom. pl. -ān, -āṃ (the difference is orthographic and of no consequence). The acc. pl. ending used as nom.; a reflex of the general MIndic confusion between the two cases. In verses only; sporadic, but hardly to be disposed of by emendation: *ramanti tān krīḍanakapramattān* SP 86.6 (vs; so mss.; KN em. *te* . . . °*ttā*, so WT without note); *adhyeṣaṇāṃ devagaṇasya tūṣṇīm, agṛhṇa devān adhivāsanaṃ ca* LV 7.13, 'I silently accepted the request of the throng of gods for instruction, and the gods (accepted) my assent;' all mss. *devān*; only a nom. pl. is possible; -*n*- possibly saṃdhi-consonant (§ 4.65); *hayagajarathapattīṃ* (v.l. °*ttī*) *sainya śrīmadvicitrāṃ, dvāri sthita nṛpasyā śrūyate uccaghoṣāḥ* 80.13–14; no acc. construction is possible; the forms in -*āṃ* and -*ī*(*ṃ*) certainly intend noms.; all mss. and both edd. -*vicitrāṃ*, which (as well as *sthita*!) Calc. note construes as gen.; *abhinadita manojñāṃ* (v.l. °*jñā*) *haṃsa krośncān mayūrān* (v.l. °*rāḥ*) 80.21; all forms can only be noms.; *pravarṣamāṇān* 220.3, all mss.; Lefm. em. °*ṇā*; can only be nom.; in LV 357.3 read °*sahasrāṃś c' ośarī*(*r*) *ātmabhāvā*, 'and hundred-thousands (of rays) came forth from his body(?)'; here all mss. are said to read the acc. pl. form; it could be construed as nom., subject of *ośarī*(*r*). But more likely the latter means 'sent forth' (the Buddha being the subject), with *ośarī* for *osirī* or *osirī*; see Dict. s.v. *avaśirati* (3), which is used in this sense; the spelling with *a* for *i* occurs elsewhere in mss. — *sarve te niravaśeṣām* (v.l. °*ṣam*; Senart em. °*ṣā*) *abhūd buddhasya śrāvakān* (Senart em. °*kā*) Mv i.250.20.

8.86. Nom. pl. -āni, the nt. ending, with masc. nouns (see § 6.4): -*putrāṇy* . . . *udyatāni* Mv i.155.15; *putrāṇi mahārājasya sadṛśāni* iii.167.3; *bahūni bālāni caranti loke* ii.92.7; *yāni vānarāṇi* . . . *okaṭṭitāni* (mss.) iii.29.17, *te vānarāṇi* 18; *pādāni* 30.11; *kośāni* 42.9 (but *kośa* also nt. Skt. Lex.); *masakāni* (= *maś*°) 101.10; *tāni mṛgapakṣigaṇāni saṃtrasanti* 146.17; (*sahasraṃ*) *dīpavṛkṣāṇi niśi pradīpyanti* 177.7; *kṛtāvakāśāni vadetha yūyaṃ* 368.10, 'do you (ascetics) speak, being granted opportunity'.

Vocative plural

8.87. Voc. pl. -ā, -a. The endings -*ā* and (chiefly m.c.) -*a* may, of course, be used in the voc. as in the nom. pl.: *yādṛśatattvabhūtā* LV 47.5 (end of a line). — *kulaputra* SP 86.9 (addressed to a group; not to only one member of it, as suggested by Kern, note to Transl.); *mārṣa* 175.3. — *māriṣa* Mv iii.292.10; in a verse, but at the end of an anuṣṭubh line, hence not m.c.; yet certainly plural; *māriṣa* iii.334.14, seemingly plural.

8.88. Voc. pl. -āho, a special MIndic voc. pl. ending. Taken by Lüders, in Hoernle MR 162, as of Mg. origin and so as evidence that the protocanonical Pkt. was Mg. In BSOS 8.512 I have pointed out that it is to be identified with the Ap. ending *-aho, -ahu.* It is not limited to verses but occurs also in prose, not only of Mv but of SP, at least in the Kashgar rec.: *kulaputrāho* SP 253.1, 255.11; acc. to Kashgar rec. *āvusāho* 378.1; *kumārakāho* 73.6; *kulaputrāho* 270.12; all prose; ed. with Nep. has forms in *-ā(ḥ).* — *amareśvarāho* LV 47.5. — (mostly from prose): *vāsiṣṭhāho* Mv i.38.4; 257.13, 15, 19 etc.; *amātyāho* ii.436.12; 437.2; *kumārāho* 436.18; 437.8; *bhavantāho* (mss. °*toho*) 479.15; *jambūdvīpakāho* (69.8 °*pikāho*) *udyānavarāho* (79.11 adds *ramyāho*; in 79.11 mss. °*dvīpakāhā*, and so v.l. in 83.3) iii.69.8; 71.13; 79.11; 83.3; *viparyastāho* 292.10; 293.12; 294.4; *māṇavakāho* 378.19 (v.l. °*kā*). Cf. §§ 9.100, 10.192.

8.89. Voc. pl. -āvo. In Mv i.317.15, 16 occurs *āvusāvo*, voc. pl. (see Dict.); this rare ending is otherwise known only with fem. *ā*-stems as nom.-acc. pl., and may be borrowed from them (§ 9.93), like nom. pl. *-āyo, -āya* above, § 8.82.

Accusative plural masculine

8.90. Acc. pl. -āṃ, -ām. The writing -āṃ for -ān is very common in the mss. (and editions) of most texts, both before consonants and before pause. It is hardly necessary to cite instances, but some from SP and LV are given HJAS 1.78; from Mv, i.153.6 *kāmāṃ*, i.115.16 *pādāṃ*. Somewhat more noteworthy are spellings with *-ām* before a vowel. These may perhaps be regarded as representing *-ā* (next paragraph) plus hiatus-bridging *m.* E. g. *āyuḥsaṃskārām utsṛjantānāṃ* Mv i.125.19 (vs; 2 of 6 mss. °*ram*, Senart em. °*raṃ*; Pali *āyusaṃkhāra* is regularly plural); *ślokām imām* (Senart em. *ślokān imān*) *agāsi* i.130.6 (prose); *susaṃyatām* (Senart em. °*tāṃ*) *ṛṣayo darśanāye* iii.366.20 (vs). — *-pratyekabuddhām abhibhavati* KP 84.5 (prose). — *vanditva pādām amitaprabhasya* Sukh 50.6 (vs). — *yām* (= *yān*) *atītajina yām* (= *yān*) *anāgatā ... bhāskarāṃś ca yān* (text erroneously *caryān*) Gv 55.7 (vs). — *ya imām evaṃ bhadrikāṃ sūtrāntāṃ pratikṣepsyanti* LV 88.14 (prose; no v.l.; cf. 89.7–8 *imān evaṃrūpān sūtrāntān*); *nirmitām abhinirmiṇvanti sma* 350.19, probably 'they create-by-magic magic personages'.

8.91. Acc. pl. -an, m.c. for -ān: *sarvāś* (read °*vāṃś*?) *ca dṛṣṭi-* (should read °*ṭī*, m.c.) *-gatan utsṛjaṃ[ti]* KP 18.8 (vs).

8.92. Acc. pl. -ā, fairly common, chiefly in verses; but also in prose of Mv, and occasionally elsewhere, it seems. It is best regarded as the nom. form used as acc.; cf. the following paragraphs, and the acc. ending used as nom., above. *buddhā ca bodhiṃ ca* (read *na* with WT?) *prakāśayāmi* SP 47.12; *iṣṭāmayā* (all mss., ed. em. °*yān*) 50.9; *cakravāḍā* 355.5. — *anātmā nirīkṣathā yoniso imā dharmā* LV 37.12 (vs); *varṇā guṇāṃ* (so read) 47.11; and in prose, *tān ... aprameyāsaṃkhyeyā gaṇanāsamatikrāntakalpātikrāntān buddhā* (all mss., Lefm. em. °*ān*) *bhagavanto 'nusmaranti sma* 4.7–8 (cf. Weller's note, 15, which rightly suggests taking °*saṃkhyeyā* as a separate acc. pl. but fails to note that the mss. have likewise *buddhā*); *aprameyāsaṃkhyeyā gaṇanāsamatikrāntān bodhisattvān* 30.22; possibly *śakaṭā* 382.1 (§ 8.38). — Mv (very common, in prose and verses alike; the following examples all prose): *daśa kuśalā karmapathā ye hi samādāya vartanti* i.3.1; *adrākṣīt satvā narakeṣu anubhavatā* (so with mss.) ... *ūrdhvapādā adhośirā* ... 5.3; *tāṃ nairayikā* 17.9; *bhītā* 26.15; a series of accs. in *-ā* 30.2; *dharmā* 61.4; *vaśibhūtā* 74.21; etc. — *sattvā* Suv 51.15 (vs). In this and most texts common in verses.—In Divy rare; but *maṇḍīlakā paktvā* 258.9, mss., ed. em. °*kān*, which the mss. present later, lines 12, 14.

8.93. Acc. pl. -ās, -āḥ; the nom. form used as acc., cf. the preceding. Not limited to verses; not exactly common, but the examples are numerous enough to establish the usage. Those cited are from verse except when marked as prose. *-pūrṇāḥ* SP 9.3; *praskanda saṃsāri niruddha durge magnāḥ punaḥ* (so both edd.!) *duḥkhaparaṃparāsu* 54.8 (the three adjectives all agree with *sattvān*, preceding; KN note calls them 'ungrammatical'); *sarvāś* (so all mss., KN em. *sarvā*, which WT keep without note) *ca cakravāḍā sa paśyati* 355.5. — *dravyāmbarāś* (Calc. °*rāṃś*, without mss. authority) *ca puruṣān* LV 42.21; *deva paśyi mānuṣāś ca mānuṣā amānuṣāṃ* 75.15, 'the gods looked upon men, and men upon demons'; *tyaji tvayi ... dhanamaṇikanakāḥ* 165.9 (so all mss. and Calc.; Lefm. em. °*kā*); *buddhadharmāś* (all mss. and Calc.; Lefm. em. °*māṃś*) *cāmukhīkaroti* 180.5 (prose; not noted by Weller). — *apsaravargāś ca (pratigṛhṇa)* Laṅk 6.5; ed. suggests em. to °*gāṃś.* — *drumā paśyanti śobhanā, haritān* (mss. write °*tāṃ*) *patrasaṃchannās tān āyānti ...* Mv i.11.9–10; note variety of acc. pl. forms; *-ā* twice in line 9, *-ān* twice and *-ās* once in 10; *badhyāś* (Senart em. °*yāṃś*) *ca saṃgopāyanti* i.96.8 (prose); *-dharmā asādhāraṇāḥ* (acc.; Senart em. °*ṇā*) *pra-* 142.5 (prose). — *parvatacakravāḍapariyantāḥ* (*catvāra dvīpa ... āvasati sarvān*; 2d ed. °*sarvā*; can only be acc.) Gv 254.18 (vs, end of line).

8.94. Acc. pl. -a, shortening of *-ā* (see above) m.c.; only in verses, but common there. Sometimes, when a vowel follows, a hiatus-bridging consonant (§ 4.57 ff.) is inserted: SP 86.5 *svaka-m-atra putrān* (so all Nep. mss.; Kashgar rec. different). *aśva eḍakān* SP 10.12; *dvīpa tathaiva* 11.10; *saṃpīḍita* 48.10. — *jihma vipaśyatha divya ātmabhāvāṃ* LV 49.12; *priyasuta* 165.10; *guṇa* 167.3. — *daśāṅgula* Mv ii.8.11 (so mss., Senart em. °*laṃ*, unmetr.); *bodhyaṅga sapta* 324.2; *vimāna sarvāṃ* 333.10; *paśyitvā stūpa buddhānāṃ* 370.17 (so read, cf. ms. C); *kalpa* 370.21; in 393.19–20 read with mss. (line 20) *nirmālya* (for °*yāṃ* of text) *so apanaye*; *kula* 395.13 (or neut.?); *aśva* iii.23.20 (mss., Senart em. *aśvā*, metrically inferior). — *jina sarva* Suv 45.10; etc., common. — *varṣa acintiya* Samādh 19.24. — *-saṅgha* Gv 236.2; etc., common. — *rātripraśānta* (... *sattvān*) RP 3.13; *sattva* 10.12; etc., common. — *jina* Bhad 7, 25; *kalpa* 22; etc., common.

8.95. Acc. pl. -e. The regular Pali and Pkt. ending; not common, but not so rare as represented in HJAS 1.79, tho I have not noted any case in SP. (Originally pronominal; for its use in pronouns see §§ 21.30, 31.) Only in verses except for Mv. Cf. also next. (Also as fem., § 9.95.) *śleṣayitvā krame* LV 94.8; *pūrve nimittasupine imi adṛśāsi* (pron. *add*°) 196.12; *mukhapuṣpake* 201.19. — *vikīrṇe* (so read) Mv i.42.17 = 53.14 = 337.5 (Senart °*ṇāṃ*; mss. *vinikīrṇo, vinikīrṇe, vikīrṇe*); *saṃghe ca te na bhindanti* 101.10 (all mss., Senart em. *saṃghaṃ*; the pl. makes excellent sense, 'they do not disunite assemblies of monks'); *paryeṣanti tīrthe* 170.8; *sadevake loke* 215.2 = ii.17.18 (with mss. ii.17.18; in i.215.2 mss. *sadeva-loke*, unmetr., Senart em. °*kaṃ lokam*); *vinīvaraṇe ca dharme abhisameti* i.312.9–10 (prose); *vikrame sapta vikramate* ii.20.19; *avahāyāśvachandake* 166.9, 'abandoning the horse and Chandaka'. — *sa imāṃ* (= *imān*) *bhāsate loke* Ud xvi.5, 'he illumines these worlds'; later var. *sa imaṃ bhāsate lokaṃ*, but one later fragment keeps *imāṃ.* — *sarva prayuñji* (see note) *svakasvaka dharme* Śikṣ 343.2, 'all would carry out each his own duties.'

8.96. Acc. pl. -i, m.c. for preceding, only in verses and not common. *evaṃvidhā supini adṛśi* (pron. *add*°) LV 197.17 'saw such dreams'; so Tib. (better than as loc., 'saw such things in a dream'); *naragaṇi* 233.9 (so Lefm.; certainly acc. pl.; but several mss. with Calc. °*gaṇa*); *gehi* 240.18 (all mss.; Calc. *gehaṃ*, unmetr.). Cf. also *imi*, LV 196.12, § 8.95.

8.97. Acc. pl. -u, rare, and only in verses, m.c.;

fundamentally a nom.-acc. sg. ending, transferred to pl. as in the nom. pl. (§ 8.84). *kaṣaṭu tān* SP 44.11 (WT's ms. K′ *kaṣaṭa*); *nirgatu* 88.1, Nep. mss.; Kashgar rec. and WT *nirgata*; KN em. *nirgati* (!); certainly acc. pl. with *dārakān*. — *śrutv' imu dharmāṃ* Samādh 19.33 'having heard these conditions'. Régamey em. *imu dharmaṃ*, acc. sg., and in next pāda he also em. *adharmaṃ* for *adharmāṃ*. But this double emendation is obviously impossible; Tib. cited p. 81 n. 138 indicates pl. for both; therefore *imu* must also be acc. pl., unless we emend gratuitously. — *parivṛtu nāthāṃ* Bhad 25; (*buddhāṃ*) *niṣaṇṇaku* (no v.l.) 28.

8.98. Acc. pl. -āni, nt. ending with masc. nouns (cf. § 6.4): *sarvāṇīmāni kumārakāṇy* SP 73.2 (prose; so all mss., except Nep. *sarvāṇimāṃ*; note domal *ṇ*!); *etāni brāhmaṇāni* Mv i.309.10 (prose); *dāsāni* iii.42.1 (prose); *putrāṇi* 79.3 (vs); *varmitāni ca puruṣāṇi catvāri* Suv 106.1 (vs); many other examples from Mv in Dschi, NAWGött. 1949, 273 ff.

[**8.99. Acc. pl. -āna**? In HJAS 1.79 f. I admitted *-āna* or *-ānā* (in verses) as an acc. pl. ending on the basis of one form in SP and one in LV, supported by one SP form in *-īna* from an *i*-stem. The LV passage, 196.15 (*d*)*hatānā*, is found in no ms.; some mss. (*d*)*hatānāṃ*; others with Calc. (*karāṃ caraṇā*) *viśālaṃ*, which had better be adopted. This leaves only *sarvāṃś ca sattvāna* (*tathaiva cāhaṃ*) SP 323.13, which can hardly be anything but acc. pl.; WT em. to *sattvān pi*, but no sound scholar will agree to such an easy but violent evasion. The photostat of ms. K′ reads: *sarvāṃś ca sattvān aham adhisthihāmi*; omitting the metrically impossible (Sktizing) syllable *ma*, we get, with *ṣṭh* for *sth*, ... *sattvān ah' adhiṣṭhihāmi*, which is probably the correct reading; on mg. see Dict. s.v. *adhitiṣṭhati* 3.]

Nominative-accusative plural neuter

8.100. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -ā (**-āḥ**?).This is common, as (at least sporadically) in Pali, AMg. and other Prakrits. Pischel and Geiger regard it as the Vedic ending. I think Hemacandra 1.33 was better advised in considering such forms 'masculine'; that is, the masc. nom.-acc. pl. ending is also used with neuters, as vice versa (§§ 8.86, 98). Chiefly in verses; also in prose of Mv, and a few (sometimes doubtful) cases elsewhere; these are specifically noted below. *balā* SP 30.11, 62.2; *koṭiśatā c' anekā* (v.l. °*ke*) 91.1 etc., common. — *roṣavākyā* LV 43.3; *-nayutā ... vinītā* 48.13–14; *vāhanā* 78.18, 79.6; etc., common in verses. Weller 45 lists half a dozen cases in LV prose, but most of them are to be taken otherwise (HJAS 1.80); at most *parijñātā sattvacaritā* 351.11 may be admitted as a fairly plausible instance. — *duḥkhā* Mv i.5.3 (prose); *asthīni avaśeṣitā* (3 mss. °*tāḥ*) 15.3; *vaihāyasā* 18.9 (prose; taken by Senart as adverb, blend of *vihāyasā* and *vaihāyasaṃ*); *vividhā duḥkhāni* 27.3 (prose); *indhanā* (mss.) *vinā* 67.8; *śāsanā ca* 121.10 (v.l. *śāsanāni*, Senart em. °*naṃ ca*); *patrā ca phalā ca* (repeated six times) 194.7 ff. (prose); *imā* (v.l. *imā-m-*) *utpalāni* 233.3; *tṛṇā* (in same line *tṛṇāni*!) 328.17 (prose); etc., common. — *dvīpāni saratnapūrṇā niryātitā* Suv 146.1–2; etc. — *tādṛśā yādṛśā lakṣaṇā* Samādh 22.15; *balā* 22.16. — *jātimaraṇā* RP 7.17. — *anantā* Bhad 47; *yā ... agrā* 56 (see Dict. s.v. *pariṇāmana*). — *kulā baddhā* Divy 76.8 (prose). — Once, at least, the mss. even present the ending *-āḥ*, at the end of a line: *sarvakāryāḥ* LV 313.20 (vs), so best mss., Lefm. em. °*yā* (v,l. °*yaṃ*, but plural verb).

8.101. Nom.-acc. pl. -a, shortening of preceding m.c., as in the masc.; only in verses. Common here, as in Ap.; Alsdorf 57 records Kumārap. as showing it 26 times to only 4 times each of *-aī* and *-āī*. *saptāha trīṇi* (WT °*ṇī*, m.c.) *paripūrṇa* SP 54.13; *rātriṃdiva* 62.9; *yānaka* 87.7; etc.— *-sahasra* LV 11.20; *puṣpa* 49.8; *vāhana kṛta sajjā* (so divide) 79.16; *padma rucirā* (so divide; followed by *mlānāni*) 193.20; etc. — *cīvara* Suv 4.13. — *kṣetra pi tāttaka* Samādh 19.16; *dvādaśa yojana* 19.21. — *kṣetra svaka* RP 5.12. — *kalpa* Bhad 11; *bala* 38; *praṇidhāna* 44; etc.—Pronoun *ya*: *bhojana pāna daditva ya* (ed. *daditvaya*) *labdhā* Śikṣ 338.16, 'giving food and drink which have been got.'

8.102. Nom.-acc. pl. -āṃ. Not only in the acc., but apparently even in the nom. (as happens in masc. nouns, § 8.85), the masc. acc. pl. ending *-āṃ* (= *-ān*) occurs a number of times in what, it seems, are at least normally neuters; cf. *-āni* in masc. nom.-acc. pl. This has been recorded only in verses. *supināntarāṇīdṛśā* LV 195.3 (vs) and *svapnāntarāṇīdṛśā* 8 (vs), 'the contents of (my) dreams are such'; so Lefm., but nearly all mss. both times *-īdṛśāṃ*; can only be nom. pl. — *etāni ... narakāṃ* (or masc.? acc. pl.; no v.l.) Mv i.12.9; *trīṇi saṃyojanāṃ tyaktvā* (two mss. *saṃyojanā*) 192.7; *yadā satyāṃ* (no v.l., = *satyāni*) *prakāśayet* 251.1. — *skhalitāṃ* (= °*tāni*) *gaveṣī* RP 18.10; *ratnāni ... suśubhāṃ* (acc.) 52.16.—*bala sarvāṃ* (acc. pl.) Bhad 38; *saukhya viśiṣṭāṃ* (v.l. °*ṭaṃ*) 47; *āvaraṇāṃ ... sarvāṃ* 57 (acc. pl.; in Gv 547.17 both printed as ending in *-ān*).

8.103. Nom.-acc. pl. -e, or m.c. -i (§ 8.81), the masc. ending, in a word which ordinarily, at least, is neuter: *aṅgam-aṅge* (nom. pl.) LV 223.15; *yasyā lakṣaṇi kāyu citritaḥ purimaśubhaphalaiḥ* 123.3, 'who has the signs (and) a body adorned by the fruits of former merit'. But most mss. read *lakṣaṇa*. (Even *lakṣaṇi* should not be taken as instr., correct HJAS 1.81.) And pronouns, *te nirarthāni utsṛjya* Mv ii.206.3 (vs), 'abandoning these (i. e. *tapā* = *tapāṃsi*) as useless'; LV (vss) *karmā ... ime* 42.7; *ima* (i. e. *ime*) *āsana* 115.9; *ceṭasyābharaṇāni deth' ime* 123.7; *ime* (sc. *bhājanāni*) 383.12.

8.104. Nom.-acc. pl. -u, as in the masc. nom. and acc. pl.: *jānayi sarvi vikurvitu teṣāṃ* Bhad 45. No v.l. for *vikurvitu*, which can only be acc. pl. So *alaṃkṛtu* (with *kṣetra*, pl.) Bhad 47.

8.105. Nom.-acc. pl. -āṃsi, the ending of nt. *as*-stems. Not recorded for MIndic *a*-stems; but cf. the instr. sg. ending *-asā* (and in Pali also loc. sg. *-asi*), § 8.41. *svaśarīrāṃsi* Gv 539.12 (prose). — *para-mantrāṃsi* Mmk 366.13; *hṛdayāṃsi* 496.5 (vs); *-pretāṃsi* 504.20 (vs). In LV 307.7 (prose) Lefm. *keśāṃsi*, with all mss., tho *keśa* is normally masc.; Weller 33 suggests influence of preceding *urāṃsi* (mss. *urasāṃsi* or *udarāṃsi*). See Dict. s.v. *keśas* for possible support for the *s*-stem.

8.106. Nom.-acc. pl. -ānī. The normal ending *-āni* may appear with final *ī*, m.c.: *kuntalānī* LV 49.20 (most mss. read °*ni*; end of pāda, but regularly long in this meter).

Instrumental plural

8.107. Inst. pl. -ai? This is read quite often by Lefmann in his edition of LV; but usually the majority of his mss. do not support him (see e. g. his Crit. App. on 236.9 and 18, 237.7–8), and I regard this as merely a matter of bad editing. In LV 93.2 and 5 *gandhodakai* is, indeed, read by most mss., but A (perhaps the best) has °*ke*, and a loc. sg. would be syntactically possible. (Delete paragraph 2 under Instr. pl. in HJAS 1.81; if *lakṣaṇi* be read in LV 123.3 it should be taken as nom. pl.; see § 8.103.)

8.108. Inst. pl. -ehi. Very common in both nouns and pronouns. In Mv it prevails even in prose, where it seems to be decidedly commoner than the Skt. *-ais*; but in other texts only in verses. It is the regular ending in Pali; in Pkt. *-ehiṃ* is regular, for which according to Pischel 368 *-ehi* occurs only in verses m.c., and sometimes in prose before enclitics. It is curious that *-ehiṃ* seems never to occur in our dialect, even when meter requires a long final. In that case either *-ebhis* is used, or

more rarely the final *i* is lengthened (see below). Once, only, I have recorded *imehir* (followed by a vowel), in Mv i.90.6, a prose passage; probably the *-r* is to be classified as saṃdhi-consonant ('hiatus-bridger'). *dantehi* SP 85.12; *putrehi* 87.4; *anyamanyehi arthehi* 125.14; *-putrehi* 278.11 (quoted as *-putrebhi* Śikṣ 47.15); etc., common.—*vatamsakehi* LV 172.6; *puṇyehi* 235.4; etc.—Mv (examples here cited only from prose; extremely common thruout the work): *(a)prameyehi kalpehi* i.1.14 f.; *aparimāṇehi tathāgatehi* 2.2; *āyasehi nakhehi* 5.5; *katamehi* 120.8; *yogācārehi* 9; *paripūrṇehi ca daśahi māsehi* 148.1; etc. Such forms jostle the (seemingly less common) ones in standard *-ais*: *imehi . . . adhyāśayaiḥ* i.89.6; *ākārehi* 89.9, resumed in 12 by *ākāraiḥ*; *viviktaṃ kāmehi viviktaṃ pāpakair akuśalair dharmaiḥ* 228.3.—*lakṣaṇehi* Samādh 22.19; *bhāvehi* 22.30, 31; *apramāṇehi dharmehi, akalpitehi dharmehi* 22.51. — *buddhehi* Suv 24.2; 38.2; *vṛkṣehi* 41.6; *lokapālehi* 133.6; 134.1, 3. — *-bāndhavehi* Gv 214.14; *lakṣaṇehi* 240.19; etc. — *etehi tribhi sthānehi* Ud xx.16.—*hīnehi* Sukh 74.3.— Pronominal stems, besides some cited above: *tehi* SP 279.1; 280.5; Mv i.193.9 (prose); Samādh 19.32; Sukh 51.1; *yehi tehi* Dbh.g. 22(358).21; *yehi* SP 89.5; Śikṣ 4.3; Gv 255.1; *sarvehi* Mv i.187.1; *anyehi* SP 96.3; *katamehi* Mv i.170.12 (prose).

8.109. Inst. pl. -ehī, rare, and only in vss., m.c. for *-ehi*. (Generally *-ebhis* or its saṃdhi representatives are used instead.) Only pronominal forms have been recorded, viz. *tehī* SP 194.8 (but Kashgar rec. *tebhiḥ*), and *yehī* SP 9.1; 49.9; 52.9; 97.9; LV 222.20; Sukh 51.2.

8.110. Inst. pl. -ebhis; the regular Vedic ending, on which *-ehi* (above) is based; here probably by secondary Sanskritization of the MIndic form. Often used in verses, at the end of a pāda, (as *-ebhir*) before vowels, and before consonants when a long final syllable is required. In prose very rare; I have noted only *-nirdeśebhiḥ* KP 29.2; *imebhir* Mmk 4.20; and in the Kashgar rec. of SP 328.9 (Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 135), *-samebhiś ca (bodhi)-sattvebhi(r)*, for ed. *-samaiś ca bodhisattvair*; *cāraṇebhiḥ* six times, and *cāraṇaiḥ* six times, in the same two passages (almost, but not quite, in regular alternation with one another), MSV i.34.11–15 and 35.11–16. The rest are in verses: *-dhvajebhiḥ* SP 89.2; *naṭebhir jhallamallebhir* 280.6.— *-siṃhāsanebhiḥ* LV 80.19; *-guṇebhir* 111.13; *ābharaṇebhir* 123.4; *-priyebhir* 230.14. — *raudrakarmebhiḥ* Mv i.9.11; end of a pāda; *-ehi* would do just as well metrically, but no v.l. is recorded. This ending is extremely rare in Mv; in fact I have failed to note another case (but cf. next paragraph). — *-caritebhiś* Suv 4.12; *varṇitebhiḥ* 44.7; *-sahasrebhir* 160.5; *sarvebhir bodhisattvebhis* 161.11; *vicitrebhiś ca puṣpebhir vicitrebhiḥ phalair api* 165.2. — *śatebhiḥ* RP 20.17; *jinebhiḥ* 27.17; *-praharebhiḥ* 32.15. — *rutebhir* Gv 231.3. — *jinebhiḥ* Bhad 3, 14, 56; *rutebhiḥ* 4, 18, 30; etc. — *duṣṭebhiḥ* Mmk 494.18; *mudritebhiś* 494.19. (Rare in this text.) — Pronouns: *tebhis* Suv 160.1; *yebhiḥ (-ir)* SP 14.10; LV 343.10; Suv 161.15; MSV i.276.20; 277.1.

8.111. Inst. pl. -ebhi, chiefly in verses as Sktization of *-ehi* above, or as shortening m.c. of preceding (yet cf. next paragraph). But occurs in Mv prose, tho rarely. In most texts much rarer than the regular MIndic *-ehi*. *anyebhi sūtrebhi na tasya cintā* SP 99.3, read with Kashgar rec. — *guṇebhi* LV 46.18; *kramatalebhi* (so, one word) 94.17; *pratyayebhi* 177.17; *devebhi* 224.3. — *ayoviṣkambhanebhi* Mv i.8.2 (prose; in the same sentence, line 3, *satejobhūtehi*); *āryadharmebhi* (so mss.; Senart em. *-ehi*) 337.1 (prose; forms in *-ais* in line 4). — *etebhi ślokebhi* Suv 44.7; *-puṇyebhi* 44.12; *-varebhi* 49.3; *-caurebhi* 57.4.—*puṣpebhi* Gv 43.12. — *kuśalebhi* Dbh.g. 8(344).10. — *-varebhi* Bhad 5, 6; *-puṭebhi* 6; *-gatebhi* 14, 56; *-sutebhi* 14, 25; *-rutebhi* 18. — Pronouns: *tebhi* SP 280,2 (so read with Kashgar rec., ed. em. *tehi*); Bhad 23, 24; *yebhi* LV 171.3; 343.8; *sarvebhi* LV 138.4; *anyebhi* SP 99.3 (so Kashgar rec.).

8.112. Inst. pl. -ebhī, would seem to be interpretable only as metrical lengthening for *-ebhi*, like *-ehī* for *-ehi*. As we saw *-ehī* is not common, and *-ebhī* seems to be even rarer (and only in verses). Its existence can, however, hardly be denied; the independent standing (apart from metrical requirements) of *-ebhi* is confirmed by its occurrence in the prose of Mv (above), and metrical lengthening of its final *i* is quite typical for our dialect. *turiyebhī* LV 169.22. So most mss.; the meter is troublesome; the variants (*turiya, turiyabhī*) do not seem to improve it. — *svarebhī* Dbh.g. 18(354).12; followed by *e-*. Note that here a long final can be produced only by lengthening the vowel, since *-bhir* before a vowel would still be short. — *-rutebhī* (at the *end* of a dodhaka line) Śikṣ 329.5 (cited from Ratnolkādhāraṇī).

8.113. Inst. pl. -abhis? This and the next two are sporadic and doubtful. In LV 172.4 and 215.10 ed. *ratnabhiḥ*; all mss. end *-abhiḥ*; in the first passage at least, and probably in the second, meter demands a short penult. With this ending we may compare the common Ap. ending *-ahiṃ* (Pischel 368). In HJAS 1.82 it is suggested that *-abhiḥ* may be analogical to the *n*-declension (*nāmabhiḥ* etc.), which in MIndic and BHS is often inflected according to the *a*-declension.

8.114. Inst. pl. -ibhis, m.c. for *-ebhis*? Possibly in Mmk *varṇibhiḥ* 134.12 (vs; doubtfully recorded in Dict. under *varṇin*, q.v.) and *lakṣapramāṇibhiḥ* 139.25 (vs) 'measured by lacs' (also, possibly, based on an otherwise unrecorded stem *pramāṇin*; see Dict.).

8.115. Inst. pl. -ābhi? If acceptable, this would be the fem. ending transferred to the masc.-nt.; *sarvendriyābhi* LV 189.15 (vs), most mss. (the variants, °*yabhiḥ* and °*yibhiḥ*, cf. the preceding two, are metrically bad); Lefm. em. °*yebhi*, perhaps justifiably.

Dative-ablative plural

8.116. Only regular Sanskrit forms noted, except *-ebhya* m.c. for *-ebhyaḥ*: *narakebhya* Kashgar rec. for °*keṣu* SP 94.5.

Genitive plural

8.117. Gen. pl. -āṇa. The Pali ending is *-ānaṃ*; in Pkt., especially M. and AMg., this and *-āna* occur side by side. In our dialect *-āna* is the commonest (non-Sanskrit) ending, before both vowels and consonants. In Mv it is not infrequent even in prose, but in all other texts it has been noted only in verses, and only in positions where meter favors a short ultima.

8.118. Before vowels it is not exactly common (*-ānam*, or even *-ān'*, being apparently commoner), and has not been noted in prose. Examples from verses: *pañcāna* SP 83.3; *bālāna* 99.4. — *tatropaviṣṭāna* LV 27.19; *mānuṣāṇa* 115.1. — *manujāna* Mv i.73.4; *kāmāna* 184.13; *buddhāna* (but v.l. °*nam*) 269.5. — *dharmāṇa* Samādh 8.22; *buddhāna* 19.22; *lokanāthāna* 22.17. And, with fusion with following initial vowel: *mārgānāṣṭāṅgikaḥ* Ud xii.4 (= Skt. *mārgāṇām aṣṭ°*).

8.119. Before consonants (prose passages from Mv are so marked), very common: *sugatāna* SP 61.8; *bālāna* 87.6; *mṛdukāna* 89.5.—*śākiyāna* LV 76.3; *puṇyārthikāna* 223.10.—Mv, mss. *ravantāna* or °*naṃ* (Senart em. °*nāṃ*) i.6.1 (prose); *-mahiṣāṇa śūkarāṇa kukkuṭāna* 17.1 (prose); *kalpāna* 35.13 (prose); *jināna* 62.2, 64.2; *lokanāthāna*, *agrapudgalāna* 80.11 and 13 (prose; the more striking because preceded by parallel phrases containing regular forms in *-ānāṃ*); *āryāṇa* iii.419.16; 420.8 (in Pali version of same verse, Jāt. iii.354.18, *ariyāṇaṃ*, unmetrical!); etc., very common.—*kṛtapuṇyāna* Suv 4.10; *sattvāna* 28.11. — *dharmāṇa* Samādh 8.23, 24; *kalpāna* 8.29; *marutāna* 19.21. — *nāyakāna* RP 12.8. — *-dharmāṇa* Gv 24.17; *vṛkṣāṇa*

43.12. — *jināna* Bhad 2, 4, 5 etc.; *-sutāna* 3, 28. — *adhanāna* (so divide) Sukh 22.8; *buddhāna* 49.4.

8.120. Gen. pl. -ānam, -ānaṃ. This ending, in the form *ānam*, occurs only before vowels, and I have not noted any certain occurrence in prose, even in Mv (but note Mv iii.114.19 below). *dvipadānam* SP 53.8; *manujānam* 68.10; *sarvajinānam* 193.1.—*sattvānam* LV 219.3. — *bodhisattvānam* Mv i.91.6; 107.1; *dvipadānam* 316.13; *tridaśānam* ii.35.18 (mss.); 52.12 (here Senart with v.l. °*āna*); *trayastriṃśānam* iii.1.17; *narāṇam* 108.2; *dvipadānam uttamo* 114.19 (printed as prose; I am not certain that it is not originally a bit of verse); *tridaśānam* 367.3. — *narāṇam* Samādh 8.21. — *-ratānam* Gv 473.10. — *śuddhakakālakānam* (*eḍakalomnām*) Mvy 8397 (?), so Kyoto ed.; formula cited in Pali with *suddha-kālakānaṃ* (see Dict. s.v. *kālaka* 1). But Mironov reads °*kālakānām*.

8.121. In the form *-ānaṃ* it occurs at least once before a vowel, in a prose Mv passage, *guhānaṃ aśīti* i.54.5; so at least all mss. read; Senart emends to *guhānāṃ*, keeping the anusvāra (which is the only questionable feature of the reading of the mss.). Otherwise this, the regular Pali and Prakrit ending, occurs only before consonants, and is very rare in our texts; we may however reasonably suspect that later copyists have changed not a few *-ānaṃ* readings to *-ānāṃ*, and even that careless editors have done the same without recording the fact (as responsible editors like Senart sometimes do, with proper record of the fact). Only the following have been noticed: *ravantānaṃ* or °*na*, mss. (Senart em. °*nāṃ*) Mv i.6.1 (prose); *devānaṃ* ii.352.1 (vs); *tānaṃ devānaṃ*, mss. (Senart em. *devatānāṃ*, allowing *tānaṃ* to stand!) iii.304.3 (prose). — *satyānaṃ cature* Ud xii.4 (vs).

8.122. Gen. pl. -ana, only m.c. for *-āna*: *anyana* (= *anyeṣām*) RP 21.4 (vs).

8.123. Gen. pl. -ān', before vowels; only in verses, as demanded by meter, with MIndic saṃdhi; that is, for *-āna* (from *-ānaṃ* = *-ānāṃ*) with elision of final vowel before initial vowel: *prakāśayantān' iha* (for Skt. *prakāśayatām*) SP 229.9; *sugatān' iha* (WT *ihā*, m.c.) 359.3. — *hitāya bhūtān' abhibhur* Mv i.167.9; *buddhān' ādityabandhunāṃ* ii.232.11. — *buddhasutān' atha* Bhad 9; *sarvajinān' anu-* 17.—Read *manujān' upapattim* Dbh.g. 7(343).6.

8.124. Gen. pl. -ān, -āṃ. We find also occasionally forms written *-ān*, *-āṃ* before consonants, and even *-ām* before a pause (at the end of a line of verse), which seem certainly intended as genitives plural. They can hardly be connected with the preceding cases of *-ān'* before vowels. Rather, we must assume that they are based on the analogy of Skt. consonantal stems, which in our dialect, as in MIndic generally, often show both the old consonantal endings and those of *a*-extensions. Thus doublets arose like *vaṇijānām* (LV 387.10, prose) beside *vaṇijām*, both gen. pl. of *vaṇij(a)*. This then led to sporadic forms like *nayanāṃ*, *gatāṃ*, by the side of regular *nayanānām*, *gatānām*. Cf., as a sort of converse process, Pali *tesānaṃ* (= *teṣām*) etc., Geiger 105; our language has such forms as *eteṣāṇām*, § 21.44. Writings in final *-n* instead of *-ṃ* (*-m*) are purely orthographic, or may even be treated as scribal errors. Examples, all from verses (meter proving the soundness of the tradition): *prekṣatu* (for °*tāṃ*, see next paragraph) *nayanān na cāsti tṛptiṃ* (nom. sg.) LV 49.16, 'and there is no satiating of the eyes as they gaze'; *daśadiggatāṃ* (read °*di-gatāṃ* with most and best mss., m.c.) *jinottamānāṃ* 163.14, 'of the noble Jinas in the ten directions'; *bodhāya cittam atulaṃ praṇidhāya sattvāṃ* 356.11, (Bodhisattvas speaking) 'having vowed our minds in an unequalled degree to the enlightenment of creatures'.—*anyathā citryamānaṃ* (so read with most mss. for ed. *citra*°) *hi lobhanīyaṃ hi bāliśāṃ* (so mss.; ed. °*śān*, but an acc. cannot be construed) Laṅk 365.14, 'for if otherwise variegated, it would be a thing coveted of fools'.—*bodhāya prasthitāṃ sattvāṃ sadā siddhir udāhṛtā* Mmk 59.22, 'for creatures that have set out for enlightenment, success is always declared'; *duḥśīlāṃ* (here meter requires *duḥśīlānāṃ*! probably a monosyllabic word has been lost) *jugupsitāṃ* 66.24; *nānyeṣāṃ kathitā siddhiḥ bāliśāṃ strīṣu mūrchitām* 101.22; *duḥkhināṃ sarvalokānāṃ dīnāṃ dāridryakhedinām, āyāsoparatāṃ kliṣṭāṃ teṣām arthāya bhāṣitam* 104.19, 20 (all the forms preceding *teṣām* are gen. pl.); *śrāvakapuṅgalām* 108.23; 109.1 (final in line; can only be gen. pl.).

8.125. Gen. pl. -ānu. Since *-u* appears as phonetic reduction of *-am*, *-aṃ* (*-ām*) (§ 3.58), *-ānu* can stand for the MIndic resultant of Skt. *-ānām*. Cf. such pronominal gen. pl. forms as *teṣu*, *yeṣu*, *pareṣu* (for Skt. *teṣām* etc.), § 21.40, and, from consonantal stems, forms like *prekṣatu* LV 49.16 (in preceding paragraph). Only in verses: read *tṛṣitānu* SP 324.10 with most mss. (only one °*āna* with text). — *sugatānu sutāḥ* Gv 476.22, 'sons of the Sugatas'. — *bahupuṇyānu hetavaḥ* Mmk 119.23 (ed. as one word, but I cannot believe in a stem **anuhetu*); *gṛhya-m-akṣāṇu sūtritam* 121.16 (? ed. as one word; interpretation uncertain); *pittakāntānu dehinām* 148.15 (this seems a clear and certain case; for *-kāntānāṃ*); perhaps *śasyānu* KP 44.6, see Dict. s.v. *anuvarṣa*.

Locative plural

8.126. Loc. pl. -iṣu, -asu. Extremely rare, and only in verses m.c., are reductions of the ending *-eṣu* to *-iṣu* or even *-asu*. I have noted only: *sarviṣu* (m.c. for *sarveṣu*) Śikṣ 344.15 and 17 (cited from Ratnolkādhāraṇī). — *sarvasu* Mmk 377.4. — *sarvasu janmasu* Gv 544.14; = Bhad 16, which however reads *sarvasu* (for *sarvāsu*) *jātiṣu*.

8.127. Loc. pl. -eṣū, m.c. for -eṣu: *gṛheṣū* LV 57.1.

9. Ā-stems

9.1. The non-Sanskrit forms of the *ā* declension include, to begin with, a number of definitely Middle Indic forms, recorded as such in Pali or Prakrit or both:

Acc. sg. *-aṃ* for *-ām*

Oblique singular in *-āya* and *-ā* besides *-āye*, see below

Abl. sg. in *-ātas* (and phonetic variations)

Loc. sg. in *-āyaṃ*

Nom.-acc. pl. in *-ā* and *-āyo* (and *-e*, see below)

Inst. pl. in *-āhi*

9.2. There are also one or two endings which are clearly MIndic but not recorded, at least in Geiger or Pischel, as occurring in Pali or Prakrit. Most notable of these is the nom.-acc. pl. *-āvo*. The oblique sg. *-āye* may also be included here, since it is recorded in Pischel only without *-y-*, tho it is evidently essentially the same as the standard Prakrit *-āe*. It is however found in Aśokan inscriptions.

9.3. Purely phonetic developments from either Skt. or MIndic endings, chiefly in verses and m.c., and in large part recorded (under the like conditions) for MIndic dialects, are:

-a for *-ā* as stem-form in composition, as nom. sg., voc sg. (originally nom. used as voc.), acc. sg., oblique sg., and nom.-acc. pl.

-i for *-e* as voc. sg.

-am for *-ām* as acc. sg. (also *-ān*, orthographic)

-ayāṃ for *-āyām* as loc. sg.

-ābhi for *-ābhiḥ* (or for MIndic *-āhi*, above) as inst. pl.

-āna for *-ānām* as gen. pl.

-asu for *-āsu* as loc. pl.

-āsū for *-āsu* as loc. pl.

9.4. Originally masc. and nt. endings are used in fem. nouns on a rather large scale. Such forms occur in Prakrit (Pischel 358, 359) and Pali (Geiger 76); they are probably commoner there than Pischel, in particular, seems inclined to admit. At any rate they cannot be emended out of our texts, tho most editors have tried to do so; they are, in fact, pretty surely commoner than our editions suggest. We find *-u* (for *-o* = *-as* and perhaps for *-aṃ*) in nom. and acc. sg.; *-ena* (and *-ayena*) inst. sg.; *-āt* abl. sg.; *-asya* gen. sg. (pronouns); *-e* loc. sg.; *-e* nom. (of pronouns) and acc. pl. (MIndic masc.); *-āni* nom.-acc. pl.; *-ān*, *-āṃ* acc. pl.; *-āho* voc. pl. (MIndic masc.); *-ais* and *-ebhiḥ*, *-ehi* (MIndic) inst. pl. Compare the reverse process, fem. *ā*-endings used with masc. and nt. *a*-stems (§ 8.2). Cf. §§ 6.1 ff.

9.5. And finally there are a number of morphological analogies which do not seem to be recorded in Pali or Prakrit: *-ās* and *-ām* as nom. sg.; *-ā* and *-āram* (in *bhāry-āram*) as acc. sg.; *-āyā* and *-āye* (a little doubtful) as nom. pl. and *-o* (doubtful) as acc. pl.

Stem form in composition

9.6. Often shortened to *-a*, almost always in verses and clearly m.c. But also in prose: *-prajña-prabha-raśmi-* LV 9.11; both edd., no v.l.; noted by Weller 16, and supported by his ms.; *velajñaś ca* 218.20; no v.l.; not noted by Weller or others; associated with *kālajña* and *samayajña*; *vela-* for *velā-* perhaps by attraction to them. So also *vijña-prāpta*, beside *vijñā°*, see Dict. s.v. *vijñā*; *kālajño velajño samayajño kālaṃ ca velaṃ ca samayaṃ ca āgamayati* Mv ii.233.15; see under acc. sg. *-am* for *-ām*, below; *kāṅkṣa-prahāṇam* RP 8.10 (*kāṅkṣa* as masc.? see § 9.13).

9.7. In verses, common everywhere, where meter requires short: *vicikitsa-prāptam* SP 64.3; *krīḍa-ratīṣu* 88.5. — *cinta-manaḥ* LV 41.16; *māya-devi* 75.5. — *suśrūṣa-kāri* (*śu°*) Mv i.156.11; *gaṅga-vāluka-sameṣu* iii.253.1. — Compounds containing *pipāsa-* Suv 39.7; *kṛpa-* RP 3.2; Gv 54.11; *prabha-* RP 3.9; Gv 241.1; *prajña-* Bhad 27; 37.

Nominative singular

9.8. Nom. sg. -a, often in verses m.c. I have noted at least one case in prose, *eṣa . . . pravrajyopasaṃpadā* Mv iii.329.13, and two cases at the end of lines of verse where there is no metrical reason for the shortening: *yena na śodhita carya viśuddha* Samādh 19.22 (for *śodhitā caryā viśuddhā*). The first two m.c., but there is no metrical obstacle to *viśuddhā*. Apparently not misprint, since Régamey cites it p. 16. *pūja jane sadātra cala sidhya* RP 30.4, which I take to be for *pūjā . . . (a)calā sidhyā* (i. e. *siddhyā*, see Dict. s.v.; or read *siddha*, *siddhā*?).

9.9. Otherwise, only where meter requires short *a*, but common everywhere: *tṛṣṇa* SP 92.6, *pratiṣṭha* 94.3; *pūja-nantikā* 341.8 (= *pūjā anant°*). — *kanya* LV 28.17; *pratirūpa* 28.18, 20; 29.12; *vasudha* 297.2. — *saṃpaśya-māna* Mv i.155.3; *sthita* ii.339.15; (*sā . . .*) *prāpta bodhiḥ* 347.3; *saha* 380.18 (so mss.; Senart *sahā*, spoiling the meter). — *ukta avidya* Suv 61.4. — *naivātmasaṃjña bhavate 'pi na jīvasaṃjñā* RP 14.5; *pativrata tyakta saputrā* 22.17. — *niṣṭha* (thrice) Bhad 46. — *upajāta* Gv 212.14. Pronoun: *eṣa . . . ṛddhibhāvanā* Mv i.66.12.

9.10. Nom. sg. -ās (?). Sometimes the mss. add visarga (or other representatives of *s*) to a nom. sg. in *ā*. The editors regularly emend; often, I suspect, without even recording the reading of the mss., so that it is hard to be sure how commonly the forms occur. It is, of course, possible that such readings are mere corruptions. Yet they might have been used by the original authors, as hyper-Sanskritisms. The MIndic nom.-acc. pl. ending *-ā* is common in our texts, and was certainly used by many authors. Since this made nom. sg. and pl. alike, the nom. pl. *-ās* might easily have been used also in the sg. by analogy. The fact that other vocalic stems so often end in *-s* might have helped. Two examples, both from verses: *kṣipraṃ bhohī* (3 sg. fut., with 2 sg. fem. subject) *prīti-prāmodyalabdhāḥ* LV 196.4 (so all Lefm.'s mss.; em. *°labdhā*; Calc. *°lābhāḥ*, without note, presumably em.); *praṇidhī iyam evarūpāḥ* 415.21 (so all Lefm.'s mss.; both edd. *°pā*; certainly nom. sg. fem.).

9.11. Nom. sg. -ām. The use of the Skt. acc. sg. form as nom. is quite common in the mss. of Mv, and at least sporadic elsewhere. As in the preceding (*-ās* for *-ā*), it may have been actually used as a hyper-Sanskritism, induced by the identity of MIndic nom. and acc. forms, both sg. and pl. Note that the converse, *-ā* as acc. sg., is also common, and often accepted by the editors, sometimes even by Senart, who rejects *-ām* as nom. Meter, of course, cannot be concerned here; but it is to be noted that *-a* for Skt.

-ām, acc. sg., is about as common, where meter favors it, as it is for nom. sg. *-ā*. *dharṣita* (for °*tā*) *mārasenāṃ* (for °*nā*) LV 353.2 (vs); so Lefm. with most and best mss.; Calc. with some poor mss. °*nā*.

9.12. In Mv the mss. very commonly present such forms, not only here, but in other vowel declensions, both masc. and fem. Senart systematically emends to the regular Skt. forms. A few examples out of many: In Mv i.14.5 and 17; 15.9 (vss) Senart reads *oruddhā* (15.9 *āvṛtā*) *janatā bahu*. Once all six mss., and twice all but one, read *janatāṃ* (some corruptly °*nāṃ*); nearly all likewise *bahuṃ* or *bahūṃ*; *eṣāṃ . . . praṇidhiṃ* Mv i.61.2 (prose), all mss.; Senart em. *eṣā . . . praṇidhi*; certainly nom. sg.; *gāthā hi dharmasaṃhitāṃ* 92.16 (end of vs), all mss.; Senart em. °*saṃhitā*; *adhivāsanāṃ* (mss., Senart em. °*nā*) . . . *vijñātā* 263.4 (prose). These cases are typical of Mv and could be multiplied many times. In most texts, however, such forms rarely occur in our mss., if the reports of the editors can be trusted.

9.13. Nom. sg. -u. Rarely, and only in verses, the texts seem to show forms in *-u* (also in acc. sg., § 9.23), as in masc. and nt. *a*-stems for Skt. *-as*, *-am*. If not mere corruptions of tradition, they are best regarded as the masc.-nt. forms taken over into the fem. owing to MInd. breakdown of distinctive gender forms, § 9.4. The clearest cases noted are: *anusmṛtī bhāvanu śabda niścarī* LV 182.21. There can be no doubt that *bhāvanu* (both edd. and all mss. *-nu*) represents a nom. sg. of *bhāvanā*. *tvayi mati pratibalu amṛtarasa dadā* LV 165.6 'in thee is competent wisdom; give (them) the essence of nectar.' Calc. °*bala*, but Lefm.'s mss. all °*balu* (for °*balā*). Or (?): 'in thee is wisdom; give them essence of nectar that is competent' (to slake the thirst mentioned in the preceding line); but this seems to me forced and unlikely. *anuprāptu . . . bodhiḥ* LV 243.7. But here *bodhi* may be masc., as it may be in Skt.; to be sure in Pali it is cited only as fem. by PTSD, but Childers gives both genders. In our dialect it is usually fem. In this same line there is doubt about the form of a modifying pronoun; Lefm. reads *seti* (= *sā-iti*), but several of his mss. read *so ti* (masc.). — *parivartati tīkṣṇu dhārā* Gv 213.6. — *bodhi-kāṅkṣu mama vidyate mune* RP 9.13. There is no evidence for a masc. or nt. **kāṅkṣa* (or Pali **kaṅkha*), unless the cpd. *kāṅkṣa-prahāṇam* (in prose of RP 8.10, § 9.6) be taken as such. *imu bhaktiḥ* RP 27.9. — *ruju bhūya vardhate* (both edd., no v.l.) 'their disease increases more' SP 96.2. No masc. noun **ruja* is recorded in Skt. or Pali. But *ruju* could stand for *rujo* (*rujas*), nom. pl. of *ruj*, 'diseases' (altho subject of *vardhate*, sg. in form).

Vocative singular

9.14. Voc. sg. -i for -e. Instead of the regular ending *-e*, forms in *-i* occur, but only in verses and certainly m.c. Any final *-e* is likely to be treated thus. E. g.: *gopi*, for *gope*, voc. of *Gopā*, LV 236.4; 237.9 and 11.

9.15. Voc. sg. -a. This occurs rarely and only in verses. Like Pkt. vocs. in *-ā* (Pischel 375; apparently Pali has none except the like of *amma*, Geiger 81.2), it is doubtless to be understood as a nom. form used as voc. *agrasattvadhāra* LV 76.6 'O thou (Māyā) that bearest the Supreme Being!' — *devata* Suv 60.3, voc. to *devatā*. But the best ms. reads *daivata*, voc. to *daivata*, and this may be the true reading (or, on the other hand, it may be merely a Sanskritization).

Accusative singular

9.16. Acc. sg. -am, -aṃ. In most texts, this ending seems to occur only in verses, regularly in the form *-am* (not *-aṃ*), before a word beginning with a vowel, and usually where meter requires a short syllable. Thus: *dagdha-ulkam abhi*° Mv i.65.18; so all mss., and so meter demands; Senart em. °*ulkāṃ*, spoiling the meter. — *pūjam īdṛśīm* SP 15.3; *imam eva cintām* 61.11. — *tāṃ pūrvāṃ gira varam* (= *giraṃ varāṃ*) *anucintyā* LV 164.11; *gira varam anuravi tatu varaturiyaiḥ* 164.22 (so read; cf. notes of Lefm. and Foucaux, II p. 133; supported by Tib.) 'they continued to sound the excellent words with the excellent musical instruments'; *chinnāṃ jālikam a-* 194.20; *śriya kriyam atulām* (so read) 361.18. — *Amitābhapuriṃ varam eva* Bhad 62. — *caryam imām* RP 16.12. — *kṣematam abhyupeti* Dbh.g. 4(340).10. But in Mv i.305.9 (vs), the meter is indifferent, and in fact the mss. read *tam enāṃ avadad rājā* (Senart em. *tam enam*; both are fem.).

9.17. Apparent cases of *-aṃ* before a consonant, except in Mv, are questionable. Thus in SP 63.5 (vs) *prathamaṃ giraṃ*, *prathamaṃ* is an adverb, not an adj. with *giraṃ* (Kern, with Chinese, SBE 21 p. XLI line 34). And in Suv 234.17 (vs) *taṃ bodhi gambhīram udāram iṣṭāṃ*, most mss. read *iṣṭvā*, which makes good sense; if this be adopted, *bodhi* may be understood as masc. (cf. § 9.13), and *taṃ* would then be normal Skt. But in Mv there are clear cases of *-aṃ* before consonants, where shortening of the *ā* to *a* cannot be m.c.; moreover it occurs in prose. It is the normal MInd. ending, Pali and general Prakrit; the strange thing is not that Mv has it, but that it has been virtually eliminated in all other texts, judging from the editions, except where meter compels its use. Cf. the loc. sg. *-āyaṃ* for *-āyāṃ*, § 9.80. Senart often, but not always, emends. Examples: *kalpakoṭīm asaṃkhyeyaṃ* Mv i.169.18 and 170.5; before consonant; so all mss. both times; Senart em. °*yāṃ*; he regards the form as plural; *yaṃ velaṃ* 361.3, 362.2, and elsewhere, 'what time . . .'; here Senart keeps the mss. reading, as in: *kālajño velajño* (§ 9.6) *samayajño kālaṃ ca velaṃ ca samayaṃ ca āgamayati* ii.233.15. The frequent collocation of *velā* with *kāla* and *samaya* makes this word peculiarly susceptible to admission of apparently masculine forms. — *seyyaṃ* (for *śeyyāṃ*) ii.234.10 (prose), mss.; Senart em. °*yāṃ*. On the other hand, in iii.411.14 (also prose), before a vowel, Senart keeps the reading of the mss., *śeyyam api*; also in iii.126.8 *āṇattikaṃ* (the stem is °*kā*); but in iii.130.12 *āsitaṃ*, mss., Senart em. °*tāṃ*. — In an *āryā* verse occurring thrice, Mv i.145.8, 202.5, and ii.6.2, with variants, Senart prints the form *ahiṃsaṃ* or *avihiṃsaṃ*, before a consonant, but either *ahiṃsa* or *avihiṃsa*, for °*sāṃ*, is to be read each time.

9.18. As prior member of a tatpuruṣa cpd., *prabhaṃ-kara*, 'light-maker', especially as epithet of a Buddha, is widespread. It represents Pali *pabhaṃkara*, Skt. *prabhā-kara* (of sun and moon), and is a clear case of MIndic *-aṃ* for *-āṃ*. It seems even to have led to the creation, once (LV 123.1), of a masculine stem *prabha*, 'light'; see Dict. on both these items.

9.19. Acc. sg. -a. Occurs only in verses, m.c., but very common. Cf. Mv i.145.8 etc., § 9.17, end: *kṛtva . . . pūja jineṣu* Mv iii.140.23. — *krīḍāratiṃ sarva vivarjayitvā* SP 13.7; *pitṛsaṃjña kuryāt* 287.7. — *yo māya dṛṣṭvā* LV 28.10; *ima mahi* (= *imāṃ mahīṃ*) 165.15; *prabha muñcamānāḥ* 296.15. — *vedana . . . dukhām anubhonti* Samādh 19.20 (Régamey p. 14 misunderstands *dukhām*, which is an adjective, with *vedana* for *vedanām*). — *īdṛśa bherīṃ paśyami svapne* Suv 51.7; *īdṛśa deśana tatra śṛṇomi* 51.8. — *pūja kṛtva* RP 5.11; *tṛṣṇa utsṛja* 59.9. — *pūja* Bhad 25; *kāṅkṣa* 54. — *puja karoti* Gv 215.3; *pravartayi pūja jinānām* 231.18.

9.20. Acc. sg. -ā. In this form, of course, meter cannot be concerned, altho it is actually recorded oftener in verses than in prose. It is not recorded for Pali or any Prakrit. And I have failed to note any occurrences in other texts than LV and Mv (except, perhaps, *anyatarā* MSV iv.227.20, prose). This may be due partly to oversights on my part; it is pretty certain that it is partly due to unacknowledged emendations by editors. The form is by no means startling;

it is simply the nom. form used as acc. The forms of the two cases have become virtually interchangeable. The following list is doubtless not complete, but too long to be emended out of existence.

9.21. In LV (verses, except as noted): (*pūjanām* . . .)-*anantā* 152.4 (end of a verse); (*yantra*)*yuktā varākapratimām* 155.18 (prose; printed as a cpd.; cf. Weller 27); (*tyaji* . . .) *mahi* (= *mahīṃ*) *sanagaranigamā* 165.10, 'the earth with its towns and villages'; *śriya* (= *śriyaṃ*) *kari* . . . *purimā* 167.4 (2 mss. °*māṃ*; end of a verse); *kṛpa karuṇā janiyā* (= *janayitvā*) 168.8; *kariyati* (= *kāryate* 'he is caused to make') *anantapūjā* 185.6; *nagnā dṛśī ātmanaṃ* 194.13 'she saw herself naked' (perhaps interpret as *nagnādṛśī*, i. e. *nagna*-[for *nagnām*]-*adṛśī*?); *tṛṣṇā tanuṃ ca kari* 200.9 'and he diminished his longing'; (*imāṃ* . . .) *śayanagatā virocatīṃ* 214.16; *ekā gira* (= *ekāṃ giraṃ*) . . . *na bhasi* 235.9; *dṛṣṭvā vikāravikṛtā namuces tu senā* 339.19 (Calc. °*kṛtāṃ* . . . *senāṃ*, but without support in Lefm's mss.); (?) *anuttarā* (Calc. °*rāṃ*; mss. all °*rā*; Lefm. prints as if cpd. with next, which may be right, see § 23.8) *samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbuddhasya* 439.20 (prose); [*imā gāthā* (*abhāṣanta*) 290.20, prose, taken by Weller 33 as sing., because only one stanza follows; but Tib. has plural. In this standard situation *gāthās*, plural, are regularly announced; the author is not thinking of a precise count.]

9.22. In Mv this ending is as common in prose as in verse. It is regularly emended by Senart; yet he sometimes allows it to stand, for reasons not always evident to me: *adhimātrāṃ vedanā* (kept by Senart, with all mss.) *vedayanti* i.19.9; *adhimātrā* (kept by Senart, with all mss.) *vedanāṃ* (2 mss. °*nā*) *vedenti* 20.4 (prose); *saṃkhyā* (Senart em. °*yāṃ*) 62.13 (vs); *īrṣyā* 145.12 (vs) = 202.9 = ii.6.6 (acc. sg., mss. all °*yā* except one in ii.6.6; Senart em. °*yāṃ*); *anuddhatāṃ* . . . *girā* (acc.; Senart em. *girāṃ*) i.166.3 (vs); *utsāraṇā karonti* 223.8 (prose) = ii.26.2 'make the transportation' (the noun is *utsāraṇā*); so all mss. both times; Senart em. °*ṇaṃ*; *sugandhā, satkṛtā, supuṣpitā, sevitā* ii.53.21–22 (vss; so mss., all accs., Senart em. all to -*āṃ*); *dhītā* (Senart em. °*āṃ*) 73.17 (prose); *ghoṣaṇā* (Senart em. °*āṃ*) 73.18 (prose); *bhāryā* (kept by Senart, perhaps understanding a plural? but cf. the modifying *bhadrikāṃ*) *kalyāna bhadrikāṃ* ii.367.21 (vs); *āṇā* (so mss.; read *mamāṇā*; Senart em. *āṇāṃ*) *pratikrośe* (= °*śet*) iii.7.16 (vs).

9.23. Acc. sg. -u. See § 9.13 for the same ending as nom. sg. Only in verses. *rajani vigatu* (all mss. and Calc. *vinirgatu*; Lefm. em. m.c.) *jñātva* LV 240.11 (vs) 'knowing the night to be spent'. — Pronouns: *imu bhadracaryām* Gv 212.17. — *imu carim abhivīkṣya* RP 17.1. — *imu bhadracarim* Bhad 51.

9.24. Acc. sg. -ān, for -ām, probably merely orthographic; reflex of the MInd. anusvāra for all final nasals. Frequent, but not worth listing. Examples: *cārikān* for *cārikām* Gv 241.9, 16 (both at end of verses).

9.25. Acc. sg. -āram, -aram. Repeatedly in Mv the stem *bhāryā* 'wife' shows an acc. sg. *bhāryāraṃ* or (m.c.) *bhāryaraṃ*; variants *bhāyy*°, *bhājy*° are recorded, suggesting that more Prakritic forms may have been used in the original. No such form is recorded in Pali or Pkt., and Senart i.476 can make nothing of it; he emends here to *bhār*(*i*)*yām*. But it is clearly an analogical creation, using the *r*-stem ending of *bhartṛ* 'husband', acc. sg. *bhartāraṃ* (or m.c. *bhartaraṃ*, the like of which is recorded in Pali, Geiger 90 note 1), and of *svasṛ* 'sister', acc. *svasāraṃ*. And later, iii.503, Senart withdraws the emendation. Mv i.129.2 (vs), read *bhāryāraṃ* with mss.; 233.17 (vs), read *bhāryaraṃ*; mss. °*yāraṃ*, °*yeraṃ*, unmetrical; 234.8 (vs), read *bhāryaraṃ* with the one ms.; iii.8.6 and 9.1 (both vss, metr. indifferent) *bhāryāraṃ*, v.l. °*araṃ*; 295.7, 9 (same vs, repeated), read *bhāryaraṃ* with both mss. in 9 (short penult required metr.); Senart em. *bhāryarāṃ*; in line 7 the mss. are corrupt.

Oblique cases of the singular

9.26. For all of these (aside from certain endings peculiar to abl. and loc. respectively) Pali has only -*āya* (or its 'contraction' -*ā*, Geiger 27.2), and normal Pkt. generally -*āe* (m.c. -*āi*; -*āye* in some Aśokan dialects); only Māhārāṣṭrī, acc. to Pischel 374 f., seems to show also -*āa*, resembling Pali -*āya*.

9.27. Besides special endings for inst., abl. and loc. respectively, and the much rarer ending -*ā* (as in Pali), our language shows standardly -*āya* and -*āye* for all sg. cases from inst. to loc. The former is evidently identical with the regular Pali ending, and similar to the alternative M. -*āa*; while our -*āye* is closest to normal Pkt. -*āe*. The distribution of these among the several texts is, however, peculiar.

9.28. -*āye* (very rarely -*āe*, as in normal Pkt.; once also -*āyi*, m.c.; occasionally -*āyai* is written, by Hypersanskritism?; whether -*aye* with shortened *a* should be recognized is doubtful) is almost restricted to Mv; only a few sporadic cases occur in other texts. Yet in Mv it is much commoner than -*āya*. Both occur in Aśokan.

9.29. However, -*āya* (for which -*āyā* and -*ayā* are found m.c.) is also quite common in Mv, in prose and verse alike. In the other texts it very rarely occurs in prose, but is common in the verses.

9.30. It seems best to present -*āye* and its variants first, for all oblique cases together; then -*āya* and its variants, similarly; then -*ā* which, tho quite rare, also serves for all oblique cases; then endings which seem to be peculiar to one of the oblique cases of the sg. Pronominal forms with these endings are included.

9.31. Obl. sg. -āye and congeners. First, the ending occurs in its normal Pkt. form -*āe* twice, on the same page of Mv: ii.432.1 *hṛṣṭatuṣṭāe* (here inst.; one ms. °*tuṣṭā me*, clearly corrupt); and 9 *imāe* (here loc.; one ms. *imāya*). And again, Mv iii.180.12 *ehibhikṣukāe* (one ms. °*kāye*, the other actually °*koe*).

9.32. Secondly, as -*āi* occurs in Pkt. m.c. for -*āe*, so -*āyi* is found m.c. for -*āye*, but extremely seldom. I have noted only: Mv ii.59.6 (vs), where the reading of the mss. seems to be *āśāyi* (inst. of *āśā*), which is certainly demanded by the meter rather than Senart's em. *āśāye*.

9.33. Occasionally the mss. read -*aye*, but Senart always emends to -*āye*, probably rightly. The forms occur either in prose, or in doubtful metrical surroundings such as: -*krīḍāye* (inst.; mss. -*krīḍaye*) Mv iii.15.2; in the first half of what seems meant for an anuṣṭubh line, but so bad that I despair of interpreting it metrically. The short -*a*, however, seems metrically poor. — Doubtful is LV 117.4 (vs) *janataye*, Lefm. with his ms. A only; other mss. *janayatā*, apparently error for *janatayā* (m.c. for °*tāya*); Calc. °*tāyai*, unmetr. A dat. or gen. of *janatā* must be intended, and the penultimate *a* must be short for metrical reasons; but whether the original ended in -*taye* (-*tayai*?) or -*tayā* is uncertain.

9.34. -*āyai*, when found in the mss., may be only a Hypersanskritism for -*āye* (except, of course, when it may be a dative case form). The following seem to be instrumentals: *ākarṣaṇatāyai* Mv i.314.3; *vyaktatāyai suvibhaktatāyai gambhīratāyai akhaṇḍaśreṣṭhatāyai* ii.43.7; *anāhāratāyai* (one ms. °*tayai*) 129.5.

9.35. Next we shall present the few scattered -*āye* forms which I have noted in other texts than Mv: *ābhāye* (inst.) LV 122.20 (vs). Tho no ms. reads precisely so, it can hardly be doubted that Lefm. is right in adopting this reading. The variant *ābhāya* is metrically impossible; *ābhāyaiḥ* and *ābheya* intend *ābhāye*. — Appendix to Jm 240.20 (corruptly corresponds to Mv ii.244.12) *mānuṣikāye vācāye* (inst.). — *Amṛtāye* (gen.) Māy 245.1 (prose). Surrounded by parallel forms in -*īye*; from line 3 on, where

other gens. of *ā*-stems occur (e. g. *Mātaṅgāya* etc.), all end in *-āya*, not *-āye*. — *caryāye* Bhad 23 (vs; gen. or loc.); *Bhadracarīya samantaśubhāye* (loc.) 44 (vs), 'in the perfectly beautiful Bhadracarī'. Note the collocation of forms in *-ya* and *-ye*; no v.l. is cited for either. — *parigaveṣatāye* (loc.) KP 97.3 (prose).

9.36. There remain only forms in *-āye* from Mv, where they are extremely common, in prose as well as verses.

9.37. Instrumental: The following are samples of what seem to be instrumentals—a few out of a couple of hundred. I have cited chiefly from prose; cases from verses are so marked. *gāthāye* Mv i.56.13; 255.12; ii.84.11 etc. (common); *anulomatāye* i.63.12; *atirekapūjāye* 89.16 (construe with preceding sentence); *yāye prabhāye* 205.10 = ii.9.6; *anyāye ca janatāye* i.231.15; *manujāye vācāye* 274.3; *svakāye* 357.16; *sudhāye* ii.57.5; 59.1 (vss); *vibhūṣāye* 100.6 etc.; *imāye duṣkaracārikāye* 130.12; *tāye śyāmāye* 173.8; *agrāye paramāye pūjāye* 259.9; *senāye* 410.5; *tṛṣṇāye* 460.10; *anyatarāye vṛddhāye* iii.15.7; *etāye gaṇikāye* 38.4; *-nāvāye* 67.17; *nāsāye* 128.18 (vs); *dārikāye* 155.1, 6; *anyatarāye māṇavikāye* 184.10; *upekṣāye* 421.16 (vs); *yāye* iii.290.18 (relative); *etāye* i.309.11 etc.; *tāye* i.348.14, 17 etc.

9.38. Dative: These are, as in all declensions, much rarer, but the following seem reasonably clear: *anuttarāye* (*samyaksaṃbodhaye*) Mv i.44.5; 233.9 (prose) et alibi; *sarvajñatāye* 82.13 (vs); *puruṣasiṃhatāye* 83.6 (vs); *narasiṃhatāye* 83.8 (vs); *pravrajyāye* ii.193.19 (vs); *āharaṇatāye* 399.7, 15 (prose); *paricaryāye* 426.17 (prose); *rakṣāye* iii.48.12; *nirvidāye* 331.4; *sahavratāye* iii.223.5, 6, 9, 11; 322.12 (all prose; the form *sahavratāyai* also occurs, e. g. Mv ii.118.3 = LV 238.16; see *sahavratā* in Dict.); *tāye* i.60.11.

9.39. Ablative: these are still rarer: *paścimāye* Mv i.6.9, *dakṣiṇāye* 10, *uttarāye* 10 (but in the parallel i.6.8 *pūrvāya*); *māyāye* i.356.13, abl. of comparison, 'than Māyā'; *Uruvilvāye* ii.207.1 'from Uruvilvā'.

9.40. Genitive: these are quite common; I have recorded about 150 cases, of which the following are a sprinkling. All are from prose except those marked as from verses: *lohitikāye* Mv i.49.14; *māṇavikāye* 233.14; *anyāye ca janatāye anekasahasrāye pariṣāye* 255.6; *Gaṅgāye* 261.17 et alibi; *dārikāye* 353.2; *bhāryāye* ii.65.3 et alibi; *sujātāye grāmikāye* 131.10; *gaṇikāye* 168.14 et alibi; *śyāmāye* 173.8; *vadhukāye sudarśanāye* 445.12; *kubjāye* 459.5 (prose), 6 (vs); *prajñāye* iii.33.20; *avidyāye* ... *tṛṣṇāye* 65.19; *anāthāye* 132.15; *devatāye* 165.13; *anyāye velāsikāye* (for *vai°*) *janatāye* 223.2; *sadevamānuṣāye pariṣāye* 375.10; *parivrājikāye* 389.18 et alibi; *pravrajyāye* 450.14; *tāye* ii.65.12; 110.5; *etāye* ii.177.1, 2.

9.41. Locative: somewhat less common than the inst. and gen. but by no means rare; there are at least several score of cases in Mv. Again my citations are all from prose, except as specified: *paścimāye* Mv i.6.8, *pūrvāye* 9, *uttarāye* 10 (but in 11 *dakṣiṇāyaṃ*! two inferior mss. reading *°ṇāye*); *sudharmāye devasabhāye* 32.13; *karuṇāye* 175.4 (vs); *tāye velāye* 237.15; 267.11 and often (also *iha velāye* ii.108.9); *dārikāye* i.342.15; *kanyāye* ii.72.18; *prabhātāye* 112.9; 167.7; 449.10; *sītalāye jambuchāyāye* 208.17; *uruvilvāye* 231.7; 263.15; *katamāye niṣīdāye* (Dict.) 432.8; *vīṇāye* iii.34.18; *gaṅgāye* 163.10; 166.6; *pariṣāye samāgatāye* 393.16; *bhikṣāye labdhāye* 420.10; *tāye* ii.65.13.

9.42. Obl. sg. -āya and congeners. This ending is evidently identical with Pali *-āya*, and corresponds to M. *-āa* (alternative to *-āe*). It is common in verses of most texts, extremely rare in prose except that of Mv, where it is about as common as in verses (but in both much less common than *-āye*). It may be noted, however, that there is some reason to believe that originally other texts than Mv used it more extensively in prose also; the Kashgar recension of SP, for example, shows it where the Nepalese text has Sanskritized.—The variant *-ayā* occurs only m.c.; but *-āyā* seems, if the mss. can be trusted, to be found also in prose. It will be recalled that Skt. has a long vowel in the ultima; this may be older than *-āya* with shortened *-a*, that is, an independent phonetic development from Skt. (*-ayā*), *-āyās*, *-āyām*. — All oblique cases may use this ending, and we shall subdivide by what seem to be such syntactic distinctions.

9.43. The few occurrences noted of *-ayā* are clearly due to metrical considerations only.

9.44. Ablative: read with Kashgar rec. *-pīḍayā* SP 117.8 'from oppression' instead of text with Nep. mss. *-pīḍitāḥ*, which can hardly be interpreted. Tib. gzir las supports abl.

9.45. Genitive: *śubhakarmaniṣṭhayāḥ* (two mss. including the best *°yā*) LV 29.2 (vs); *Gaṅgayā* Sukh 8.11 (vs); *tad eva* ... *phalaṃ* ... *hiṃsayā* (v.l. *hiṃsaya*) Mv i.184.10 (vs); gen. acc. to Senart (could it be inst., 'the fruit (obtained) by a harmful (violent) act'?).

9.46. Locative: *dakṣiṇayā* SP 191.5 (vs). See also *-ayāṃ*, § 9.79.

9.47. The ending *-āyā* (see § 9.42) has been noted as follows. Note that, except in the inst., the regular Sanskrit forms would be just as good metrically.

9.48. Instrumental: *samo viṃśatigaṅgāyā* SP 304.3 (end of an anuṣṭubh first pāda; followed by *p-*; *gaṅgāya* occurs in the vicinity; tho in a vs, not m.c.); *bhāryāyā sārdham* Mv ii.443.8 (prose, no v.l.); certainly inst. (misprint for *bhāryāya* or *bhāryayā*? Elsewhere Senart sometimes emends such forms; see below); *-locanāyā* Av i.265.5 (end of triṣṭubh; the first *ā*, but not the second, metrically necessary); *pramuditāyā* Gv 256.11 (end of line; as preceding).

9.49. Genitive: *mallikāyā* SP 362.4 (vs, end of pāda, before *t-*; meter does not demand final *-ā*); *gopāyā* LV 159.10, prose, all mss., also Weller's ms. l (Weller 27); next word begins *ś-*; *prajñāyā* 164.13 (vs), m.c.; *nairañjanāyā* 271.8 (vs), m.c.; may be loc.; *tṛṣṇāyā* 204.21, prose, all mss.; followed by *s-*; may be inst., or abl.

9.50. Locative: *kālakriyāyā* (WT *°yāṃ* with ms. K′) *samupasthitāyāṃ* SP 384.2 (vs); *pariṣāyā* Mv i.74.21 (prose! but v.l. *°ye*; Senart here em. *°āyāṃ*; contrast next); *gaṅgāya ca yamunāyā ca antarā* Mv iii.363.19 (prose! so Senart with one ms., but the other has *yamunāya*, matching *gaṅgāya*; this is probably the true reading. Could also be taken as gen.).

9.51. Chiefly before a vowel, the ending appears as *-āyam*, the *m* being perhaps a saṃdhi-consonant. However, *vaddha-paṭikāyaṃ* seems used in Mv iii.258.16; 260.12 as instr. of *°paṭikā* (Dict.) before consonants. Other instrumentals: *girāya-m anupūrvaśaḥ* Mv i.10.7 (vs); *gāthāya-m* (v.l. *gāthāye*) *adhyabhāṣati* Mv ii.207.4; *prabhāya-m abhigṛhṇiṣu* (Senart em. *prabhāya atigṛhyate*) 307.7 (vs).

9.52. Of quite different nature is the ending *-āyāṃ*, before a consonant, once in *vāhyato* (= *bā°*) *devasabhāyāṃ* Mv i.32.12 (prose) 'outside of the gods' assembly'. Here the regular Skt. loc. is used as abl. or gen., a retroflex of the common use of *-āya* for all oblique cases. Cf. § 10.141.

9.53. The only occurrences of *-āya* noted in *prose*, in texts other than Mv, are:

9.54. Instrumental: *saṃdhāya* SP 34.4; so text with Kashgar rec. and 1 Nep. ms.; *paribhāṣāya* SP 60.14 'with censure'; so Kashgar rec., to be adopted; Nep. mss. vary; text *paribhāṣaṇayaiva*; *samudravelāyo°* (for *°velāya* plus *u°*) Divy 234.13, according to mss., ed. em. *°velayo°*; *mānuṣikāya vācāya* Jm App. 240.14.

9.55. Dative: *saṃprakāśanatāya*, Kashgar rec. and Lüders ap. Hoernle MR p. 152, twice, for ed. of SP 270.11 and 271.1 *°tāyai* (with Nep. mss.); *abhijñāya* LV 416.18, certainly dat., and corresponding to Pali *abhiññāya*; in the dharmacakra-pravartana, cf. Vin. i.10.16.

9.56. Genitive (or Dative): *Mātaṅgāya* Māy 245.3,

and a series of others in the sequel. In a long list of gens. (or dats.) fem.; all the *ā*-stems end in *-āya* except *Amṛtāye* 245.1.

9.57. Locative: *devānāṃ sabhāgatāyopapatsyante* SP 478.4 and (°*syate*) 11; in this idiom loc. is regular, see Dict. s.v. *sabhāgatā.*

9.58. Further examples of *-āya*, all in verses except those (from Mv only) marked as prose, are:

9.59. Instrumental: *tṛṣṇāya* SP 48.2; *kṣudhāya* 86.2 (parallel is *dāhena*); *anukampāya* 147.4. — *māyāya* LV 28.18; *prabhāya* 198.10 et alibi; *vācāya . . . garjitāya . . . samudgatāya . . . subhāvitāya* 419.1–3. — *ehibhikṣukāya* Mv i.2.15; ii.234.2 (both prose); *bhujāya* Mv i.217.16 = ii.19.17; not dat. of *bhuja* (Senart on i.149.14) but inst. of *bhujā*; in i.149.15 (the same line) all mss. *bhujābhir*, which must be kept and which proves my interpretation; *mānuṣikāya vācāya* i.271.18 (prose); iii.72.20 (prose); *bhāryāya* ii.64.19 (prose); *gāthāya* 78.20; 207.7 etc. (prose); *lūkhatāya* 208.2 (prose); *bubhukṣāya* iii.158.10 (prose); *vācāya madhurāya* 260.8 (vs); *imāyānumodanāya* 426.6 (prose); *tāya* i.244.7 (prose); iii.294.15 (vs); in both v.l. *tāye.* — *sumāgadhāyopanimantritaḥ* Divy 402.6. Meter requires *-āy-*; in prose 402.1 *sumāgadhayā.* — *virocanatāya* Suv 49.8. — *-prabhāya* RP 55.13. — *vācāya* Ud vii.10, in the oldest text form; replaced in later recension by *vācā su-*; *vācayā* would be metrically impossible; *prajñāya* xviii.11; in later rec. *prajñayā*, with change in order; *śraddhāya* x.5 (in later rec. *śraddhayā*; meter indifferent) and xix.2. — *atulāya* Sukh 50.10. — *prabhāya* Gv 254.13.

9.60. Dative: *durgāya subhairavāya* SP 196.2 (could be other obl. cases); *sūnāya* 280.4 (could be other oblique cases). — *lokānukampāya* Mv i.40.4 (prose). In an oft-repeated formula, e. g. Mv i.50.7; 60.9; 229.18; 239.2; 330.8; 336.2; some mss. so at i.331.8, v.l. °*pāyair*, Senart °*pāyai*; at i.332.12 mss. also °*pāyai*, no v.l.; at i.333.3, 16, mss. °*pāyair* or °*pāyaiḥ*, Senart °*pāyai*; at i.336.11 °*pāyai* without v.l.; *anuttarāya samyaksaṃbodhaye* i.46.11 (prose); *pravrajyāya* iii.176.13. — *siddhikarāya* etc. (a long series of forms with this ending) Suv 110.12–111.14. — *nirvidāya* KP 126.10, 15.

9.61. Ablative: *paraṃparāya* SP 352.2 (cf. *paraṃparātaḥ* in 351.11). — *pūrvāya bhittīye* 'from the east wall' Mv i.6.8 (prose; cf. *talāto* in line 11); *anukampāya* (could be inst.) 187.16, where read *sānukampāya* (*sa*, pronoun, plus *anu*°) *nāyakaḥ*, with mss.; Senart wrongly em. spoiling meter as well as sense; *śraddhāya* ii.62.18. — *-deśanatāya, -yācanatāya* Bhad 12, could be inst., but v.l. *-āyāḥ*, suggesting abl.

9.62. Genitive: *ūrṇāya* SP 8.11; *parṣāya* 24.8; 272.12; *mṛttikāya* 51.1; *gaṅgāya* 253.3; 255.4. — *māyāya* LV 29.5; *karuṇāya* 224.1; *senāya* 311.11. — Mv (all prose except the last) *jīvamānāya* (agrees with *mālinīye*) i.311.16; *abhayāya* (in same line *abhayāye*) ii.26.5; *pāragāya* 210.10; *hṛṣṭāya* 430.18; *dehalāya* (in 17 Senart °*āye* with v.l.) 437.14, 15, 17; *gulikāya* iii.7.19; *niṣaṇṇāya* 257.15; *etāya* i.311.15; ii.65.15; *yāya* iii.2.18 (vs). — *mātur . . . janetukāya* (vv.ll. °*ye*, °*yaṃ*; Nobel em. °*yāḥ*) Suv 238.1 (vs, end of pāda). — *tṛṣṇāya* Ud xvii.9; the vs is cited Divy 56.13, with rearrangement, reading *tṛṣṇāyāḥ.*

9.63. Locative: *tasyāṃ cīrṇāya caryāyāṃ* SP 30.15; *purimā-diśāya* 9.3; *parṣāya* 36.9; *koṭīsahasrāya ca dhāraṇīye* 330.4 'and in the *dhāraṇī* that makes 1000 crores (of revolutions)'; cf. SP 327.8; misunderstood by Burnouf and Kern; *pariṣāya* 353.5; *agnikhadāya* 448.5. — *mayi . . . abhiratāya susaṃvṛtāya* LV 42.9; *mahāvyūhāya sthitaḥ samādhiye* (fem.!) 60.4. — *nāvāya* Mv i.264.14 (vs); *kalyāṇadharmāya pativratāya, prahāya* (*chandaṃ*? so Jāt., om. in Mv) (*su-*, Mv, perhaps omit) *kuladhītarāya* ii.58.1–2 (vss); these forms are found in the mss. and wrongly emended by Senart; the Pali Jāt. v.403.4–5 proves that locs. are meant; *trisāhasramahāsāhasrāya* (*lokadhātūya*, see mss. reading) ii.281.16 (prose); *rudamānāya* 427.17 (prose); *niṣidāya* (Senart em. *niṣadāya*) 432.9, 10 (prose). — *samatāya* Samādh 19.34 (v.l. °*ye*, but meter demands short). — *jinendraghoṣāya* Suv 147.1.—*cariyāya* Bhad 45. — *catuthāya* Dbh.g. 16(352).8.

9.64. Obl. sg. -ā. Likewise common to all oblique singular cases (none have been noted for the dative; but see § 36.18 *pūjanā*) is the ending *-ā*. It is much rarer than *-āya*, tho in most texts no rarer than *-āye* (this being little used outside of Mv). It is found in Pali, Geiger 81.1; Geiger regards it as a contraction of *-āya* (27.2). Apparently not known in Prakrit. Occurs only in verses except for one prose case in Mv. Several times (SP 92.6; 93.7; 191.5) the *ā* is shortened m.c.

9.65. Instrumental: *paraṃparā eva tathānyam-anyaṃ* SP 209.5. Certainly an inst. is meant, but Kashgar rec. *paraṃparāya* (meter would require °*yā*!) *tatha anyam-anyam*; *abhijña jñātvāna* (ed. *jñātvā na*) SP 93.7 (vs; so Tib., mṅon par śes pas, instr., dig nas). — (*avikopitayā*) *caryā* LV 259.14 (so all mss.); *kāyaprabhā* (must be inst.) 291.2; *maitrā vijitya . . . mārapakṣāṃ* 343.6 'having conquered Māra's partisans by love'. — *tvarāgatya* Suv 233.6 (no v.l.) 'coming hastily'.

9.66. Ablative: *dvitīyā bhūmito* Mv i.91.1 (prose) 'from the second stage'. One good ms. *dvitīyāyā*, but the other five *dvitīyā*; certainly abl.

9.67. Genitive: *upagami tīru nirañjanā* (no v.l.) *narendraḥ* LV 243.12 'the prince went to the bank of the N. (river)'; *gaṅgā yathā vālikā(ḥ)* 283.20; 284.1; 360.19 'like the sands of the Ganges'; *tṛṣṇa* SP 92.6 (vs), see Dict. s.v. *samudāgama* (2).

9.68. Locative: *evaṃ diśā dakṣiṇayāpi tatra, atha paścimā heṣṭima uttarasyām* SP 191.5. The form *uttarasyām* (not to speak of *tatra*) establishes *diśā, paścimā*, and *heṣṭima* (short *a* m.c.) as locs. — *paśya deva kumāro 'yaṃ jambuchāyā hi dhyāyati* LV 132.7; '. . . for he meditates in the shade of a jambu tree'. Lefm. °*chāyāhi*, presumably as inst.-loc. pl.; but sing. is far more natural. Most mss. °*chāyāṃ hi*, but A (the best ms.) text. In LV 421.17, read with best mss. *daśadiśata* (*yi* = *ye*). Perhaps loc. sg., with short *a* m.c. as in *heṣṭima* SP 191.5 above. It might, however, perhaps be acc. pl.

9.69. Special forms of oblique cases. Finally, a few forms which seem to be peculiar to particular cases. In the instrumental, there are to be noted only some curious blend formations. First, two borrowings of the masc. ending *-ena* (cf. below under abl. and loc.), once substituted for the fem. *-ayā*, and once blended with it into *-ayena*! Monstrous as the latter seems, it appears to be well authenticated and guaranteed by the meter: *kṣuttṛṣṇayena paritaptās* RP 32.16 (vs), 'tortured with hunger and thirst'. Only *tṛṣṇā* 'thirst' can be concerned, and there seems no reasonable ground for questioning the reading. — *animiṣatena* (all mss.) Divy 222.22 (prose); can only intend inst. of *animiṣatā*, depending on *anyatra*, 'except for the nonwinking-ness (of Indra)'.

9.70. Another form, recorded in the mss. of Mv i.158.13 (prose), seems to be a blend of the regular Skt. *-ayā* with the MIndic *-āye*, producing *-ayāye*: *caturaṅginīyā senayāye* (so five mss., including the two best; one inferior ms. *senāyā*; Senart em. *senāye*).

9.71. Parallel to the inst. in *-ena* and loc. in *-e*, we occasionally find ablatives in (masc.-nt.) *-āt* from fem. *ā*-stems. Note that in Prakrit such stems may have abl. *-atto*, according to the grammarians; this is explained by Pischel 375 as analogical borrowing from masc. and nt. nouns. *śayyāt* LV 139.14 (vs), both edd. and all mss. except A which is hopelessly corrupt; *mudrāt* 176.15 (vs), both edd. and all mss. but one; but *mudra* m.-nt. is common in Mmk (Dict.).

9.72. Much commoner are ablatives in *-ātas* (*-āto*,

and m.c. *-āta*, *-atas*, *-atu*). This is clearly a Sanskritization of the regular Prakrit ending *-āo* (*-ādo*); Geiger does not speak of it as occurring in Pali. It is hardly found in prose except, as usual, in the Mv; only one other prose case has been recorded: *svapratijñātaś cyutaḥ* RP 58.7. Prose occurrences from Mv are: *ṣaṣṭhāto bhūmito* i.127.14; *saptamāto* 136.4; *nāvāto* 217.7 'from the boat'; *abrahmacaryāto* 326.15; *piśunavācāto* ii.99.9; *takṣaśilāto* 167.1; 175.7; *diśāto* 426.5; iii.210.15 f.; *puṣkiriṇikāto* ii.438.5; *uttarāto* iii.210.15 f.; *pariṣāto* 393.6.

9.73. Examples from verses: *paraṃparātaḥ* SP 351.11; *dvitīyāto* Mv i.91.7; *pratisaṃvidāto* Śikṣ 109.6.

-āta, m.c.: *tṛṣṇāta* LV 420.4.

-atas, *-ato* m.c.: *avidyatas* Suv 60.6; 61.2 (I do not understand why Nobel calls this gen.); *prajñato* RP 55.13.

-atu, m.c.: *daśa-diśatu* LV 421.13; *vācatu* Bhad 23.

9.74. In the gen. sg., final visarga may be omitted before a voiceless consonant: *tato 'syā khalu* (so all mss., Calc. *'syāḥ*) LV 28.16 (vs). (Pronominal form.)

9.75. Further, the masc.-nt. ending *-asya* occurs repeatedly in pronouns which refer to fem. nouns. I have failed to note any similar nominal forms; but the use of *-asya* here is evidently parallel to the other masc.-nt. endings noted in fem. *ā*-stems. In some cases, to be sure, the final *-a* is doubtless only shortening for *-ā(ḥ)*, in verses m.c., usually, tho not always, before a vowel or voiced consonant; so in the following group: *niścarate 'sya ātmabhāvāt* LV 49.18; *°śravāsya mūrdhajāni* 49.20; *tathāsya netre* 49.21; *yasya* (followed by *ahu*) 79.21; *tasya* (followed by *ś-*) 139.11.—Mv i.203.13 and 19 = ii.7.9 and 15 *pramadāy' imasya* (*yatha*) etc.; in i.207.14 = ii.12.4 and 18, read *asya* each time with mss. (in i.207.14 Senart em. *asyā*), and read for the next word *sarva* with v.l. on ii.12.4 (instead of *sarve* or *sarvaṃ*, unmetrical). Not metrically required is (*udgatā-*)*sya* at the end of a line of vs LV 50.1, where Lefm. cites no variant, not even that of Calc. which reads *-syāḥ*; since it is Lefm.'s habit to report Calc. readings, may he have failed to record this reading in some of his mss. too?

9.76. However, there are quite a number of prose occurrences in the mss. of Mv, tho Senart almost always emends to *-asyā(ḥ)*. The following list is certainly far from complete, but long enough to raise doubts of the propriety of emending the form out of existence: Mv i.353.2 *tasya guhāye*; ii.459.5 *tasya kubjāye*; iii.56.10 *tasya* (kept by Senart here) *dāni śārīye*; *tasya dāni mṛgīye* 150.21; *tasya dāni* . . . 163.4; *imasya* 162.1; *asya* 163.4.

9.77. In the loc. sg. we find fem. *ā*-stems showing the masc.-nt. ending *-e*. Cf. the inst., abl., and gen. forms *-ena*, *-āt*, *-asya* above; also AMg. *giriguhaṃsi* for *°guhāe*, stem *-guhā*, Pischel 375. This AMg. form, as Pischel notes, is associated with masc.-nt. forms in *-aṃsi* and perhaps gets its ending by attraction to them. So in the following case, *upekṣe* may be attracted to the neighboring *kāruṇye*: *kāruṇye varamudita upekṣe* LV 164.15 (vs), 'thou (hast) well delighted in compassion, in renunciation'. Can only be a loc. of *upekṣā*. There is a v.l. *upekṣaye* (metr. impossible). Similarly *dhyāne prajñe* LV 162.4 (vs); *prajñe* for *prajñāyāṃ*, perhaps assimilated to *dhyāne*.

9.78. But there is no parallel form in *-e* adjoining the following: *vanalate antarhite* Mv i.342.4 and 7 (prose). Can only intend loc. of *°latā*. In LV 291.2 (vs) *daśadiśe* 'in the ten directions' we have the option of taking *diśe* as loc. sg. of *diśā*, or regarding it as for *diśi* (stem *diś*) with *e* for *i* m.c. (§ 3.60).

9.79. The regular loc. ending has penultimate *ā* shortened m.c. at least once: *rāmakakṣayām* (stem *°kakṣā*) Māy 83 (vs).

9.80. The loc. ending appears with MIndic shortening of the *ā* af the ultima, as in regular Pali *-āyaṃ* (not in Prakrit); but I have noted this only in Mv. The following examples are all from prose except those noted as vs: *dakṣiṇāyaṃ* Mv i.6.11 (parallel with *paścimāye*, *pūrvāye*, *uttarāye*); *bodhisattvacaryāyaṃ* 105.3 (with mss.); *bubhukṣāyam āneti* 188.17 (vs; here meter is improved by the shortening); *-kṛtāyaṃ* ii.38.11 (vs; meter not concerned); *parāhatāyaṃ* 282.13; *lekhāyaṃ* 423.15; 434.10; *saṃkhyāyaṃ* . . . *gaṇanāyaṃ* . . . *mudrāyaṃ* 434.11; *ekamātāyaṃ* 450.18 (mss.; Senart em. *°ya*); the same occurs as v.l. in the repetition 453.6 where Senart adopts *°mātāya* with one ms.; *pariṣāyaṃ* iii.139.20 (vs, but end of line; so mss.; Senart em. *°yāṃ*); *nāvāyam* 149.17 (followed by *ā-*); *mañjūṣāyaṃ* 167.1; *śayyāyaṃ* 275.21 (vs).

Nominative-accusative plural

9.81. As in Skt. the nom. and acc. pl. forms of this declension are identical for the most part in our dialect too. It seems best to juxtapose nom. and acc. forms showing the same ending; but we shall separate the two cases in listing examples.

9.82. Nom.-acc. pl. -ā. The regular Pali and Prakrit ending *-ā*, lacking *s* or visarga, is quite common in the mss.; editors often emend. Meter, of course, cannot be primarily concerned here; yet in most texts (Mv is an exception, as usual) forms in *-ā* seem to occur much more often in the verses than in prose, according to the mss. So far as I can see, there is no special tendency to drop the *s* before any particular consonants (as e. g. sibilants); *-ā* is quite common in sentence final. This *-ā* may be, in verses, fused in saṃdhi with a following vowel initial; examples below.

9.83. Examples from prose, nominative: *sarvaratikrīḍāś copasaṃhartavyā strī°* . . . LV 193.1 (so all mss., only Calc. *°hartavyāḥ*). — *aparyantāḥ bodhisattvena pāramitā* (2d ed. *°tāḥ*; by em.?) *paripūrayitavyāḥ* Gv 460.6. — *-prāptā* Mv i.147.13 (end of sentence); *yattikā* . . . *kanyā* ii.149.21 (pl.: both followed by voiceless stop); *antaḥpurikā ca sarvā nirdhāvitā* 449.13 (all pl.).

9.84. From verses, nominative: *gopānasī vigaḍita tatra sarvā* SP 83.5 (pl.); *yā kāci medinyāṃ jātā oṣadhayo bhavet* 126.9; *yā sattvakoṭyo* 330.12 (*yā* all mss., both edd. em. *yāḥ*); *upāsikā* (*tatra*) 384.10, apparently read by all mss. but one, should therefore be kept; both edd. *upāsikās*. — *evaṃ bahuprakārā saṃ° gāthā* LV 13.4 (so all mss.; Calc. *bahuprakārāḥ* . . . *gāthāḥ*); *jātakāṅkṣā* 49.7 (all mss.; end of line); *pramadā s-* 164.19; *rutaghoṣā t-* 167.12; *-bhūṣitā p-* . . . *nāriyo praharṣitā* 170.3–4 (end of line); *sarvā pramadānu°* 183.12. — *saṃnipatitā* Mv i.217.18 = ii.19.19 (end of line); *prasannasaṃkalpā* ii.19.20 (end of line); but in the same line i.218.1 *°saṃkalpāḥ*. — *sarvā striyo* Suv 42.4. — *pūjā* Bhad 6[2] (pl.); *yā* (= *yāḥ*) 6[2], 6[3], 7; *udārā* 7.

9.85. From verses, accusative: *kalpakoṭyo acintiyā* SP 30.15 (end of line); *tārakā* 139.3, probably to be read with Kashgar rec.; Nep. mss. *tārakān* (with masc. ending); ed. em. *tārakāḥ* (below, 139.11, Kashgar rec. reads *tārakāḥ*; Nep. mss. again *°kān*); *yady abhijñābhinirhareḥ* 141.11 (for *abhijñā(ḥ) abhinir°*; otherwise WT); *-gocarā* 279.5 (so read with Kashgar rec. and WT at end of line, for KN *°rām*; acc. pl.) — *gāthemā* LV 163.15, for *gāthā(ḥ) imā(ḥ)*; *pramadānuśikṣitā* 183.12, for *pramadā(ḥ) anu°*; *kāmakrīḍā ca-* . . . *vijahitvā* 184.7.

9.86. Nom.-acc. pl. -a. A shortening of the ending *-ā* (for *-ās*) to *-a* occurs only in verses where meter demands a short syllable, but is quite common there. Examples of the nominative: *parṣa catasra* SP 25.1; *vigaḍita* 83.5; *kṣudrika* (*oṣadhīyo*) 129.7; *sarva* (*oṣadhīyo*) 129.8. — *vividha* LV 164.5; *pramudita ratikara pramadā* (pl.) 164.19; *gātha* 167.11; 175.16; *prasannacitta premajāta nāriyo* 170.4; *dhīta* 170.13; *abhijña pañca* . . . *labdha* 172.20. — *yāttika*

vālika Samādh 19.16. — *abhinirhṛta pūjā(ḥ)* Bhad 6²; *anuttara pūja* 7.

9.87. Accusative: *diśo daśa* (WT *daśā*, m.c.) *sarva* SP 91.8; *abhijña jñātvāna* (so read) 93.7. — *ima* LV 162.8; *smarāhi ... tā ca pūja* 172.17; *rathya bharita ... kṛtvā* 240.18; *māya* 326.18; *daśa diśata* (*yi*; so read; stem °*tā*) 421.17. — *vālika gaṅgāye* Mv ii.370.21 (so read; mss. *vārika*; Senart em. *vālikā*, metr. poor).

9.88. Nom.-acc. pl. -āyo. The ending *-āyo* (regularly in this form, without regard to the following sound, and even final in sentence or line of verse; *-āyaḥ* noted only SP 15.4, perhaps editorial error?) occurs fairly often in Mv (nearly all the examples are from prose) and a few times (in verses only) in SP: if it is found in other texts I must have overlooked it. It is evidently identical with the same ending in Pali (Geiger 81.3 and note, 'analogical to *i*-stem forms *rattiyo, kumāriyo*'). Prakrit has regularly *-āo*, which might also be connected with this, as the BHS oblique sg. *-āye, -āya* are surely related to Pkt. *-āe, -āa*. Pischel 367, 376, to be sure, identifies the fem. nom.-acc. pl. *-āo* with the same ending in the masc. (where however it is much less common than in the fem.!) and derives both from *-ā*(*s*) plus *-as*, the ending of the consonant stems. Possibly the Pkt. *-āo* had more than one origin in the fem.

9.89. Nominative (all from Mv except the first four): *yebhir diśāyo daśa śobhitāyaḥ* SP 15.4; *diśāyo* 31.11 (at end of a line); *analpakāyo* 251.11 (at end of first pāda, before *s*-; WT *analpikāyo* with v.l.); *anvitāyo* (WT with ms. K′ *añcitāyo*) 306.11 (before *p*-). — *anekāyo* Mv i.6.7; *-saṃkalikāyo* 22.2, by Senart's em.; mss. *-āyā*; see § 9.91; *eḍakāyo* 25.10; *nipatitāyo* 26.3; *devakanyāyo* 216.10 = ii.19.7; *tāyo dīrghikāyo channāyo* i.249.9 (others in lines 10, 11); *niryāntāyo* (mss. *nirvā*°) 272.8; *vivāhitāyo* 351.9; *-kanyāyo ca dinnāyo* 355.11; *dārikāyo jyeṣṭhatarikāyo* 356.13; *dārikāyo* 356.15, 19; *sarvāyo* 356.19; iii.442.12; *karṇikāyo* ii.36.7; *anekāyo ... samāgatāyo* 74.10–11; *śabdāpitāyo* 110.14; *upasthāpitāyo* 433.11; *antaḥpurikāyo kuśalāyo* iii.162.13; *antaḥpurikāyo* 165.7; 166.2; *jyeṣṭhāyo* 167.19; *bhāryāyo* 222.11; *chinnāyo* 358.5; *tāyo* (besides i.249.9 above) i.6.12; ii.54.15; iii.287.3, 15, 18; *etāyo* iii.72.14.

9.90. Accusative (all from Mv): *divyāyo* i.32.16; iii.323.17; *diśāyo* ii.62.11; *antaḥpurikāyo* iii.166.1; *bhāryāyo* 222.2; *-striyāyo* 283.5.

9.91. Nom.-acc. pl. -āyā? As stated § 9.89, in Mv i.22.2 (prose) the mss. read *-saṃkalikāyā*, nom. pl., which Senart emends to *-āyo*. I have noted no other case of the ending *-āyā* as nom. or acc. pl. Yet in the *i-ī* declension there seem to be nom.-acc. forms in *-īyā, -iyā* (as well as *-īye, -iye*; cf. *-āye* below). Possibly *-āyā* also should be admitted here.

9.92. Nom.-acc. pl. -āye? Cf. the preceding; some support for the reading of the mss. in the following cases seems to be furnished by the *-īye, -iye* forms of *i*-stems, §§ 10.175 f., tho they are none too common. Nominatives (all from Mv prose): *prāṇasahasriyo* (but one ms. °*srāye*!) ... *uparuddhāye* (so mss., Senart em. °*āyo*) ii.98.17; *ratnamayāye* (Senart em. °*āyo*) *puṣkariṇīye* (Senart em. °*īyo*) ii.177.16; but here it is not certain that a nom. pl. is meant; it may be an oblique (loc.?) sg.; *paṇḍitāye* (Senart em. °*āyo*) iii.393.11; the noun is *strīyo* or, one ms., *strīye*, nom. pl.

9.93. Nom.-acc. pl. -āvo. Unparalleled elsewhere is the nom.-acc. pl. ending *-āvo*, occurring a number of times in Mv. It seems necessary to regard it as somehow secondary to *-āyo*, that is a dialectal variant of the latter. On *-v-* for *-y-* cf. Geiger 46, Pischel 254; and for Vedic and Sanskrit, Wackernagel I 188c, Ved. Var. II 246 ff. (the Taittirīya school seems to favor *v* for *y* of other schools, particularly in suffixal forms with *vin* for *yin*); my §§ 1.28, 84. —Senart began by emending to *-āyo*, but in his note on iii.149.12 wisely retracted the emendation. All the forms are from prose, and all nom. except the last (acc.).—Once a masc. form, *āvusāvo*, used as voc., is recorded: § 8.89. *tāvo* (twice; = *tās*; one ms. *tāro*) Mv iii.149.12; *antarāyakarāvo* 149.13; *saṃnipatitāvo* 364.1; *samāgatāvo* 392.7; *dhātavaḥ tiṣṭhamānāvo* (note the preceding °*vaḥ*! but no such form accounts for the others) *tiṣṭhanti* iii.65.11; (accusative:) *tāvo antaḥpurikāvo* iii.357.18.

9.94. Nom.-acc. pl. -e (-i). Rare, but seems to occur, perhaps as nom. (at least of pronouns), and more probably as acc., pl. fem.; doubtless a transfer from the masc. *a*-stems, like *-ena, -āt, -e* (loc. sg.) etc. The following, and others like it in § 6.15, may be treated as confusion of gender-forms: *ye vā istriya māya* ... LV 193.14 (vs) 'what women's wiles' (nom.); no v.l.

9.95. Accusatives in *-e* are perhaps a bit better attested; possibly *devate* LV 120.12 (vs), which is certainly acc. pl., may be associated with *devatā* rather than *daivata*. Clearer than this are: *-janate* LV 170.1 (vs), for *janatā(s)*; most mss. *janata*, which is unmetrical; best ms. (A) *janate iha dṛṣṭvā* 'seeing the people here'; *daśadiśe* (*sarve*) LV 291.2 (vs), probably acc. pl., for *-diśāḥ sarvāḥ*, 'thruout (all) ten directions'; so also (or m.c. *daśad-diśe* or the like) SP 217.13; LV 299.11; 365.2 (all vss; in the last read prob. *daśad-diśe* and before it *kṛto* with many mss.); cf. *diśebhir* § 9.104. — *sarve* (or, with v.l., *sarvāṃ*) *vāpīyo* Mv ii.449.5.

9.96. Apparently *-i*, m.c. for *-e*, occurs as either nom. or acc. pl. (either in relative clause, or object of *prajāni*, aor. to *prajānati*), in *caitasika-saṃjñi* (to *-saṃjñā*) LV 151.13 (vs).

9.97. Nom.-acc. pl. -o? Twice the text of LV seems to present (in verses) a form *diśato*, apparently acc. pl. of *diśatā* = *diś(ā)* 'direction' (see Dict.). Influence from the ending *-as* of consonantal stems? *obhāsesī daśa ima diśato* LV 162.8, 'thou illuminest these ten directions'. So both edd.; most mss. *diśito*; all ending in *-to*. *atha daśasū diśato jinatejair gātha vicitrā ... raviṣū* LV 167.11, 'then by the power of the Jinas throughout the ten directions various verses resounded'. So Lefm.; all mss. except A (the best) *daśadiśato* (one syllable short); A *dasuśa* (intending *daśasu*? should be °*sū* m.c.). If Lefm.'s text is right, a loc. numeral modifies an acc. (?) noun (§ 7.6). With this cf., for the acc. case, *diśo daśāsu* LV 314.8 'in all ten directions'; but here Tib. phyogs-phyogs dag-tu, with no numeral, suggesting *diśo-diśaḥ*, or some form of an āmreḍita cpd. of the word for 'direction' (*diśo-diśāsu, diśā-diśāsu*?).

9.98. Nom.-acc. pl. -āni. The neuter ending of the nom.-acc. pl. of *a*-stems is repeatedly recorded, in Mv prose, in unmistakably fem. *ā*-stems: *bodhisattvacaryāṇi* Mv i.1.2 (nom.; no v.l.); in next line °*caryā*, nom. sg., several times; *anyāni te rājakanyāni yattakāni jalpasi tattakāni ānayiṣyāmi*, ii.101.2–3 (acc.) 'I will bring you other princesses, as many as you say'; *etāni śivikāni* (nom.) 107.4; *niṣadyāni śayyāni* (nom.) 163.18; *-krīḍāni* (acc.) 171.5; *catvāri ca pratisaṃvidāni* (acc.) iii.67.2–3 and 4; *bahūni māyāni* (acc.) Mv ii.174.12; *tasyā nabhe vrajanto stavayiṃsu apsarāṇi* (nom.) LV 223.8 (so read with all mss. but one; Lefm. *apsarāṇāṃ*, uninterpretable) and others, § 16.24; *jaṭāni* (nom.) Mv iii.147.2; *-mallikāni* (nom.) Mv iii.80 4; others in Mv, Dschi, NAWGött. 1949, 273 ff.; see § 6.4.

9.99. Acc. pl. -ān, -āṃ. The acc. pl. of *ā*-stems is repeatedly recorded with the masc. ending *-ān, -āṃ* (the difference is probably purely orthographic; *-āṃ* is a semi-MIndic writing for *-ān*). Of course this cannot be concerned with meter. In fact it occurs in prose, even of other texts than Mv, and is commoner than most other masc. endings in the fem. *ā*-declension. *saśramanabrāhmaṇīn prajān sadevamānuṣān* LV 3.6 (prose), both edd. The *-ī-* in °*brāhmaṇīn* (two mss. °*ṇān*) shows that *prajā* is still a fem., and there is no reason to emend to sing. forms in *-m*. *iṣṭikān* 'women' LV 79.20 (vs); *lipino* (see § 10.155) '*kṣara-*

dṛśyarūpāṃ (acc. pl.) 125.12 (vs); *diśāṃ* (stem *diśā*) *cālokya cature* (for °*ro*, or rather *catasro*) 252.21 (vs); *svāṃ* (so all mss., both edd. em. *svā*) *duhitṝn* (or *duhitarī*, mss.; acc. pl.) 320.1 (prose).—In LV 322.16 ff. (vss), every line down to 323.9 incl. ends in a fem. adjective or noun in *-ikāṃ*, usually read by all mss. and kept by Lefm. All are certainly plural, referring to the daughters of Māra. So Tib., and cf. 323.2 *imās*, all mss., em. wrongly to *imā* by Lefm. Cf. also the following: *yaḥ* (all mss.; Lefm. *ya*) *svayam āgatikān* (Lefm. with v.l. *āgatiko*, which seems uninterpretable) *na hi bhuñjasi kāminikāṃ* 323.14 (in continuation of preceding passage), 'who dost not enjoy charming women that have come of their own accord to thee' (Skt. *svayam āgatāḥ*, acc. pl. fem.; cf. also next); *tāṃ* (all mss. and Lefm.) *māraduhitṝn* 323.20 (prose); *tāṃś ca* 378.16 (prose); so all mss., both edd. *tāś*; refers to daughters of Māra. — *deva-devatāṃ* Mv i.245.7 (prose; dvandva cpd.); *samudradevatāṃ* 245.9 (prose; tatpuruṣa cpd.); (*kanyā*, for *kanyās*, nom. pl.), *tāṃ sarvāṃ kumārasya upadarśayāmi* ii.149.21 (prose); *tādṛśīṃ kanyāṃ* (plur.!) 441.5 (prose); *sarvāṃ vāpīyo* 449.5 (prose; or *sarve*, with Senart and v.l.); *antaḥpurikāṃ* (once v.l. °*kān*) 449.11; iii.163.12; 165.15 (all prose); (*dhītaro*) *suvarṇasahasramaṇḍitāṃ* iii.24.8 (prose). — *tān* (sc. *pūjāḥ*) Bhad 6^2, 6^3, 7 (vss; before vowel). — (*buddhavyūhān*) *buddhavṛṣabhitān* (*buddhavikrīḍitaṃ*) Gv 17.24 (prose). Possibly read °*vṛṣabhitāṃ* (acc. sg.)? Note preceding pl., but following sg.

Vocative plural

9.100. Voc. pl. -āho: as in masc. *a*-stems, § 8.88. Possibly this is to be regarded as a transfer from masc. to fem. declension; Pischel does not cite *-āho* in the fem. *ā* declension from any Prakrit dialect. But note *devīho*, voc. pl. of *devī* (§ 10.192). *antaḥpurikāho* Mv ii.452.11 (prose).

Instrumental plural

9.101. Inst. pl. -ābhi. The final consonant of the ending *-ābhis* may be dropped in verses, m.c., as in: *ślakṣṇābhi vāgbhir* Mv i.84.5 (vs); *gāthābhi* ii.343.1 (vs).

9.102. Inst. pl. -āhi. On the other hand, the regular Pali (and Prakrit, beside *-āhiṃ*, cf. Pischel 376 and our § 8.108) ending *-āhi* is fairly common in Mv, in prose as well as verses. I have failed to record it from any other text. The following examples are all from prose except those marked (vs): *ādīptāhi saṃprajvalitāhi sajyotibhūtāhi* Mv i.22.2; *kartarikāhi* 24.14; *valgugirāhi* 163.16 (vs); *sthūlāhi* 192.12 (vs); *paripūrṇāhi* 192.14 (vs); *citrāhi darśanīyāhi* 194.4, 19; 249.5; (*su*)*madhurāhi vācāhi* 200.12 = ii.4.9 (vs); *diśāhi sarvāhi* i.201.3 = ii.4.19 (vs); *rathacakramātrāhi karṇikāhi* i.227.19; *dīrghikāhi* 249.5; *śivikāhi* ... *bhūṣitāhi* 261.11; *śivikāhi* 262.14 (vs); *devatāhi* 327.13 (prose); ii.349.21 (vs); *abhijñāhi* i.354.5 (here used as ablative); *sarvāhi kanyāhi* ii.48.5; *tāhi* 102.12 (vs); 110.3; *-vicitrāhi nāvāhi* 109.5; *gatāhi* 110.15; *vividhāhi* 126.15; 128.2; *gāthāhi* 157.10; *-muktāhi* 191.5 (vs); *devakanyāhi* ... *padumuttarāhi* 192.15–16 (vs); *etāhi śivikāhi* 216.17 (prose); 227.6 (*parṇa-śivi*°, vs); *madhurāhi girāhi* 226.10 (vs); *kṣīrikāhi* 248.16 (so read with mss., Senart °*kehi*); *akṣamātrāhi dhārāhi* 349.17 (vs); *chatradhvajapatākāhi* 349.22 (vs); *apsarāhi* 359.22 (vs); *sarvāhi ca antaḥpurikāhi* 448.15; *antaḥpurikāhi* 463.16; *-kubjāhi* iii.4.19 (vs); *tāhi* ... *śayitāhi* 74.13; *pramadāhi* 79.2 (vs); *nāvāhi*, with adjectives agreeing, 149.18 f.

9.103. Inst. pl. -ais. As in other cases, the endings of masc. *a*-stems intrude with fem. nouns, in prose as well as verses. Thus, *-ais*: Laṅk (only in vss): *vāsanair* (from stem *vāsanā*) 285.5; 293.1; 296.5, 6 etc.; *abhijñair vaśitaiś* (*ca*) 309.8; 318.8; stems *abhijñā*, *vaśitā*. Cf. also Dict. s.v. *devata* (= *devatā*), where such forms are recorded.

9.104. Inst. pl. -ebhiḥ (as in masc. *a*-stem nouns): *daśa-diśebhir* LV 416.2 (vs), in ablative sense, 'from the ten directions.' There is a v.l. *diśobhir* (as if from the lexically cited stem *diśas*?). I assume stem *diśā*, with masc. ending; cf. § 9.95.

9.105. Inst. pl. -ehi: *imehi sārūpyehi gāthehi* Mv iii.379.20 (prose; so mss.; Senart em. *-āhi*); *anyamanyehi* (so mss., Senart em. *-āhi*) *parivrājikāhi* 390.5.

Genitive plural

9.106. Gen. pl. -āna. As in the masc. and nt. *a*-stems, the gen. pl. is often reduced to *-āna*, but only in verses m.c. A few examples: *gatāna apsarāṇām* LV 49.5; *-kanyāna* 80.7; *devatāna* 221.15. — *muktāna* Mv ii.187.11; *vaiḍūryamiśrāna* 187.12; *divyakanyāna* 192.1. — *pramadāna* RP 26.16.

Locative plural

9.107. Loc. pl. -asu: I have noted only one case of reduction of *-āsu* to *-asu* in a verse, m.c.: *sarvasu jātiṣu* Bhad 16 (Gv 544.14 reads *sarvasu janmasu*, which would make *sarvasu* stand for *sarveṣu*).

9.108. Loc. pl. -āsū. Less rare is the metrical lengthening of final *u*, e. g.: *diśāsū* SP 53.11.

10. I-stems with ī and in-stems

10.1. In most of the declension there is such extensive confusion between *i*, *ī*, and *in*-stems that clear separation between them is scarcely possible. The same holds in large part for the distinction between the three genders. It will be most convenient not to try to set up separate complete paradigms, tho in some parts of our combined list of endings, special groupings will appear; namely in the oblique cases of the singular, where some endings are characteristic of feminine nouns. When it seems possible and desirable, our lists of examples will separate words which in Skt. belong to different declensional types. Even in Skt. there is some fluctuation, so the lines impliedly drawn by such divisions must not be taken too seriously.

10.2. As with *a*-stems, the bare stem in *i* or *ī* seems sometimes to be used in the functions of various oblique cases; see §§ 10.65 ff.

Stem-extensions (in *-a*, etc.)

10.3. Even in Sanskrit (Whitney 441b, 1209c) *in*-stems are sometimes made *a*-stems by addition of *-a* to *-in-*. This occurs more extensively in MIndic: Geiger 95.2, Pischel 406. Undoubtedly it started from the acc. sg. *-in-am*, analyzed as *-ina-m*. The following have distinctly MIndic aspect. First, a stem-form in composition: *hastina-pṛṣṭhe* Mv iii.178.15 (prose) 'on the elephant's back'.—Nom. sg. m.: *matsariṇa iva daridrapuruṣaḥ* (no v.l.) LV 333.8 (vs); *-gāminaḥ* RP 7.5 (vs); *ātāpinaḥ* Ud xix.1 (vs; note that the corresponding Pali vs, Dhp. 144, also has *ātāpino*, but by further changes it is there made nom. pl.); *dharmarājakulavaṃśadhāriṇo bodhisattvakulavaṃśavardhinaḥ* Gv 487.5 (vs); *hitakāriṇaḥ* Mmk 32.24 (vs); *-uttarāsaṅginaḥ* 45.13 (prose); *śilpinaḥ* 58.3 (vs); *jāpinaḥ* 103.3 (vs). Once even the stem *kali*, which is m. and seems not to be recorded as *kalin*, shows a nom. sg. *kalinas*, Laṅk 364.5 (vs).—Nom.-acc. sg. nt.: *kṛtavedinaṃ* (so read for text °*taṃ*) *ca tat kulaṃ bhavati, achandagāminaṃ* etc. LV 24.1–3 (prose; with adjectives as in Mv i.197.20 f., ii.1.10 f., but always °*gāminaṃ*; see § 10.31); *vihāyasāgāminaṃ vikurvaṇādharmiṇaṃ* (*hastiratnaṃ, aśvaratnaṃ*; cf. Mv i.108.16 f., § 10.46) LV 16.1, 10 (prose).—Gen. sg.: *vajriṇasya* Mmk 48.16 (prose); *-kariṇasya* 57.2 (prose); *śilpinasya* 58.4 (vs).—Cf. *-inā* as nom. pl. of *i*-stems, § 10.156.

10.4. Yet more anomalous from the Skt. standpoint are *a*-extensions of monosyllabic *ī*-stems, resulting in stems in *-iya-*. They may be analogical to the acc. sg. *śriyam* etc., analyzed as *śriya-m*. They have been noted only in Mmk, the text of which, as presented in the ed., seems otherwise bizarre, even for BHS. For the proper name Mañjuśrī this text repeatedly shows a stem *mañjuśriya*: as stem in composition, *mañjuśriya-gatadṛṣṭi* 64.25, 65.3 etc. (prose). And case forms, nom. sg. *mañjuśriyo mahāvīraḥ* 60.21 (vs); gen. sg. *mañjuśriyasya* 1.5, 64.21, 69.1 etc. (these all prose).

10.5. Even for the stem *strī* 'woman' a stem *striya-* is implied by *striyasya puruṣasyāpi* Mmk 54.13 (vs); the meter is quite correct and seems to guarantee the form. It may be suspected that the following *puruṣasya* was concerned in the creation of this nonce-form.

10.6. Similarly, and less surprisingly, such stems are made to end in *-yā*, keeping feminine gender; see the Dict. s.vv. *śriyā, striyā* (= *śrī, strī*); *Hiraṇyavatī* (°*tyā*); these may be Sktizations of MIndic forms.

10.7. Likewise only in Mmk occur a couple of forms in which the stem *ṛṣi* (*maharṣi*) is replaced by *ṛṣaya-*, an *a*-stem, apparently based on the nom. pl. *ṛṣayas*: *maharṣaya-siddha-sevitam* Mmk 64.23 (prose), 'inhabited by great *ṛṣis* and *siddhas*' (stem in comp.); and even instr. pl. *ṛṣayai(ḥ)*, in *mahārṣayai[r] anekamahārṣi-* Mmk 18.20 (prose; note hiatus in the compounds, and faulty saṃdhi between the words!). Cf. the nom. sg. ending *-avaḥ* from an *u*-stem, also in Mmk; § 12.5.

10.8. The irregular stem *sakhi*, 'friend', has a stem *sakhāya* (analogical to Skt. acc. sg. *sakhāyam*), see Dict. s.v.

Stem in composition: confusion of *-i* and *ī*

10.9. The above-mentioned confusion between stems in *i*, *ī*, and *in* is strikingly signalized by the substitution of *ī* for *i* and *i* for *ī* as stem-final in composition (and before *-mant, -vant*). Since Skt. *ī*-stems are nearly all fem., the latter change naturally affects only Skt. feminines. The former, however, is by no means limited to fem. nouns; it affects also masculines (*maṇi*, regularly masc.) and neuters (*asthi*), also masc. *in*-stems (*pakṣin*, etc.) which in Skt. are indistinguishable from *i*-stems in compounds. (Note also the same change in indeclinables: *vīmati* Samādh 19.35; *vītatha* Gv 55.3, etc., in verses.) Most of both types occur in verses, and could be interpreted as due to metrical requirements; but there are also prose occurrences. The latter are separated in our lists.

10.10. i for ī: prose, *vaijayanti-* LV 295.15, Lefm. with all mss., for °*tī-*; *padmini-vana* Mv i.216.3 (v.l. *padminī*°). — Verses: *mahipati* SP 35.13; *jagatiśreṣṭho* and *jagatipālās* LV 81.8 and 9 (ed. prints *jagati* both times as separate word); *rākṣasidvīpaṃ* 169.2; *padmini-(vanaṃ, vane*; v.l. *padminī*° both times, unmetr.) Mv i.215.14, 16; *nāri-(saṃgha-)* ii.328.17; *dharaṇi-raso* Suv 115.7; *vyāghri-sutān* RP 22.5; *sukhāvatikṣetra* Bhad 57 (in Gv 547.18 unmetrically *sukhāvatī*°); etc., common in verses of most texts.

10.11. ī for i (incl. *in*-stems): prose, *jñānīvad* LV 289. 14, all mss., also Foucaux's and Weller's; both edd. em. to *jñānivad*; certainly *jñānin* is the stem concerned; *pakṣījātīnām* Mv i.272.16 (to *pakṣin*); *jātīsahasrāṇi* ii.169.3 (to *jāti*); *hitaiṣī-anantakārī-karaṇatāyai* ii.264.15 (to *hitaiṣin, -kārin*). —Verses: *kṣāntībalā* SP 13.5; *dṛṣṭī-* 62.13 and 14 (but in 15 *dṛṣṭi-*, where meter demands a short); *muktāmaṇījālika-* (*maṇi*, normally masc.) 89.2; *smṛtīmatī-gatīupeta* LV 74.18; *asthī-danta* (to the neuter *asthi*) 208.17; *matīmāṃ* Mv i.43.12, so read with all mss. (the line must be read *viyākare arthadaśī matīmāṃ*; Senart makes wrong emendations); *jātī-maraṇasya* 256.6; *ṛddhīmāṃ* ii.220.10; *-gatīgata* Samādh 19.17; *dṛṣṭīgataṃ* Suv 61.13; etc., common in verses of most texts.

10.12. Probably we might just as well include here forms in suffixal *-ka* added to what at least in normal Skt. would be short *i*-stems, which here show *ī* before the suffix, where meter demands a long. I have cited such examples in § 3.17.

Nominative singular

10.13. In Pali, all *i* and *ī* and *in*-stems, masc., fem., and neut., *may* have the ending *-i*; besides this, *-ī* is found with masc. *in*-stems, and (more commonly than *-i*) with original fem. *ī*-stems; and *-iṃ* occurs with neuters. By contrast, in Prakrit, all masc. and fem. *i*- and *ī*-stems, and masc. *in*-stems, have the ending *-ī* (but Ap. *-i*, Jacobi, Bhav. § 27 etc.). Pischel knows no *-i* for any of these, except that 405 recognizes Ap. *-i*, and AMg. *-i* m.c., for *-ī* of an *in*-stem; but it is scarcely conceivable that it should not also exist, m.c., for *-ī* of other stems. Prakrit neuters have *-i*, but also *-iṃ*; and *-iṃ* (nasalized *-i*) is also recognized for the nom. of masculines by some grammarians, according to Hem. 3.19 (Pischel 379 regards it as a phonetic equivalent for *-ī*; is it not rather the acc. masc. and alternative nom. nt. used as nom. masc?).

10.14. In our dialect, the endings *-i*, *-ī*, and *-iṃ* seem to be used indifferently for all masc. and fem. *i* and *ī* stems, and at least *-i* (as in Skt. neuters) and *-iṃ* for neuters (where *-ī* also occurs, but rarely). In most texts, to be sure, the 'irregular' forms are recorded only in verses, but this may be due only to secondary regularizing of the prose to fit standard Sanskrit. The prose of Mv, as usual, is not different from verse, and occasionally the MIndic forms occur in prose of other texts; moreover, they occur in verses in positions where meter is indifferent, notably at the end of lines, so that they cannot be explained as due to metrical considerations. Furthermore, a short final *-i*, for *-is* or *-ī*, often precedes a vowel, where *-ir* would be just as good metrically; tho sometimes it is changed to *-y* in such cases, even when it is derived from a Skt. short *i*-stem and so represents Skt. *-ir*, as in: *gaty eṣāṃ* (v.l. *gatī ca*) SP 177.3; *bodhisattvasyaivaṃ bhavati pratikṛty evaṃ dharmavihāry . . . abhūt* LV 182.1 (prose), 'thus is the defense (against evil) of the B.; thus he dwelt in dharma;' all mss. *pratikṛty evaṃ*; only Calc. °*kṛtir*°; *bhūmy ālaṃkṛta* (note *ā-*, m.c.) LV 276.17 (vs) 'the earth, adorned . . .'; *-viśuddhy atha* Bhad 43 (in same line the 'regular' *viśuddhiḥ*). In the following, all examples are from verses except as specifically indicated.

10.15. Nom. sg. -i. Masc. *i*-stems: *avīci* SP 94.3; *durmati mahya putraḥ* 112.1. — *ṛṣi jirṇo* LV 102.12 (prose; acc. to Lefm. with all mss. but one; Calc. *ṛṣir*; Lefm. prints *ṛṣijīrṇo* as one word, which, I agree with Weller 24, is hardly possible. Weller erroneously assumes the like in LV 19.12, prose, *vyādhiprajñāyate*, which is a denom. verb from a cpd. noun, 'consciousness-of-disease-arises', and 34.16, prose, *satyasamādhidharmālokamukham*, which is a cpd.); *nṛpati* 81.13; *rājarṣi* 170.21; *pati* 171.1 (at the end of a pāda in a meter where a long syllable is normally required; no ms. has *patiḥ* but perhaps it should be read); *śākyamunīti nāmnā* 383.13 (with fusion with following vowel).—Mv, very common even in prose, from which are taken the following examples, a few out of many: *agni* i.21.4 and 5; 22.11; *avīci iti* 26.14; *kukṣi* 221.4 = ii.23.9; *thapakarṇi* (*in*-stem?) *gṛhapati* i.245.3; *ṛṣi*, *-vyādhi* 284.6; *śāli* 341.17; etc. — *maharṣi* Samādh 8.21 (end of triṣṭubh pāda, meter indifferent).—And many other cases in most texts.

10.16. Fem. *i*-stems: *upaśānti* SP 96.8; *oṣadhi* 129.10, 12 and 130.14; *nirvṛti* 198.6; *-bodhi* 310.12 (this word is regularly fem. in our dialect; here, at the end of a pāda, meter not concerned); etc., common. — *smṛti pratilabdhā* LV 86.8 (prose; Lefm. prints as cpd., which seems impossible, Weller 23; cf. in 86.7 *madāpagataḥ*, i. e. *mada-apa*°, for Skt. *mado 'pa*°); *avabuddhā sattvavyādhi* 351.11 (prose; so mss.; both edd. °*dhiḥ*; *vyādhi* regularly masc. but here the modifying adj. is fem.); and in verses, *bodhi* 12.11 (so best ms., required by meter; Lefm. *bodhī*); *kīrti* 29.6; *ṛddhi* 37.14; *mati* 45.15; etc., common.—Mv, common in prose and verse; our examples from prose: *bhūmi* i.77.16 (followed by *a-*); *nīti* 135.4; *-lipi* 135.5 ff. (repeatedly, at end of cpds.; Senart always *-lipī*; mss. vary but *-lipi* predominates); *yaṣṭi* 196.15; *matsyajāti* 245.2 (followed by *ā*); *aṅguli* iii.358.3 (v.l. °*liṃ*); etc. — *vīmati* Samādh 19.35; *bodhi* 22.15. — *saṃpatti* Suv 40.12; *jāti* 51.6; etc., common. — *sthiti* RP 6.9; *smṛti* 7.13. — *bodhi* Bhad 54. — *prīti* Gv 212.14 (end of pāda, meter indifferent; followed by *u-*); etc., common. — *ruci iti* (mss., ed. em. *rucir*) Divy 236.1 (prose); *kṣati na* (mss., ed. em. *kṣatir*) 404.13 (prose).

10.17. Fem. *ī*-stems, polysyllabic: almost equally common in most texts. Read *etādṛśi* SP 214.1 with WT and v.l. of KN for KN °*śa*; *yādṛśi* 329.13; etc., common. — *vyapatrāpiṇi* LV 28.13; *devi* 49.14; *nāri* 54.7; *māyadevi* 75.5 and often; *nadi* 175.9; *sāmagri* 177.6; etc., common. — *prakṛti māṇavikā* Mv i.232.16 (prose), 'the girl that has been mentioned, that is under discussion' (*prakṛtī*, for °*tā*), cf. 233.14; *upasthāpana-* (or *upasthāna-*)*kāri* iii.37.5, 8 (prose), 'a woman who serves a man sexually'; cf. °*kārikā* id., 37.12; etc. — *Madri* RP 22.17. — *maitri* Gv 230.13.

10.18. Fem. *ī*-stems, monosyllabic. The paucity of examples here following certainly does not indicate any avoidance of *-i* in the nom. sg. of these stems. It is due to the relatively small number of such stems, combined with the fact that in my selection of examples from reading, I failed to pay sufficient heed to getting samples precisely of this declensional type. — *istri* (= *strī*) LV 42.17; 236.5; *śri yā* 215.14 (so read, as two words; Lefm. *śriyā*); *cakravartiśri yaṃ* 253.3 (= °*śrīr iyaṃ*; Lefm. °*śriyaṃ*, which is senseless). — *śiri* Mv ii.94.2 and 353.17 (both in vs, but not required by meter); same in prose ii.94.9, 11 (with v.l. *śirī*); and iii.371.12, in a metrically obscure verse, with v.l. *śirī* (uncertain).

10.19. Masc. *in*-stems. Prose instances recorded only from Mv (and here marked as such); the others all from verses. — *ananyathāvādi jino* SP 32.16. — *-vighāti* LV 92.21; *tapasvi* 109.18; *cakravarti* 111.1 and 12; *yogi* 176.22; *nirapekṣi* 241.16; *doṣadarśi* 330.4. — *śreṣṭhi abhūṣi* Mv i.47.16; *cakravarti* 62.18; 158.12; ii.237.19; *śreṣṭhi* ii.175.1 (all prose). And verses: *-kāri* i.156.11; *-rūpi* 207.8; *-cakravarti* 209.15 (end of line, not m.c.); *asaṃprakampi* 292.15 (end of line); *sarvabhutānukampi tam* (so read and divide) 295.9; etc. — *sarvadarśi* RP 24.8; *-pramathi* 51.11.

10.20. Nom. sg. -is, -iḥ, -ir, etc. The regular Skt. ending of masc. and fem. short *i*-stems; occurs with fem. *ī*-stems and masc. *in*-stems, occasionally in prose, even outside of the Mv. (Prose cases marked as such.) In the verses of most texts it is specially frequent in the form *-ir* before a following vowel, altho *-i* is often allowed to stand in that position; there is no prosodic difference; the *-r-* has the effect of a 'hiatus-bridger' (cf. §§ 4.61 ff.). When not followed by a vowel, these endings are prosodically equivalent to *-ī*.

10.21. Fem. *ī*-stems, polysyllabic and monosyllabic: *rājadhāniḥ* LV 22.1 (prose; no v.l.; only °*nī* is recorded in Skt. and Pali; not noted by Weller); *jananir iyaṃ* 49.13 (to *jananī*). — *śirir* (v.l. *śirī*) *nāma* Mv ii.89.19 (prose). — *Ratanarājaśiriḥ* Gv 285.4 (end of line of verse; not m.c.). — *visaṃjñāvatir* Mvy 7974 (so also Mironov), certainly from a stem °*vatī*; text of LV 148.9 (prose) *visaṃjñāyatī*, read °*vatī* (with pw).

10.22. Masc. *in*-stems: *ananyathāvādir* SP 92.4; 308.13 (followed by vowel both times). — *śaśir iva* LV 162.8; 362.9; 397.2. — *śreṣṭhis* Mv i.37.10; *samitāvir* 48.17; 50.2 (v.l. °*vī* both times; once plus cons., once plus vowel); *kṛkiś ca* 309.9 (in 14 below, also prose, *kṛkī ca*); *hastir* ii.458.5 (plus cons.; v.l. *hasti*) (all prose). And verses: *śikhir iv*° Mv i.67.8; *antevāsiś ca* 269.8; *-vaśis* 282.19; *śikhir yathā* 358.10; *pakṣir vā* ii.232.9; read *vaśir iddhiprāpto* (or *vaśi riddhi*°) 322.1; *keśarir vā* 332.20. — *Ratna-*

śikhiḥ Śikhiḥ Mmk 68.26, 27 (prose); *cakravartis* 140.25. — *cakravartir* (plus vowel) Gv 254.10.

10.23. Nom. sg. -iṃ or -im. Masculine and feminine. As we saw above (§ 10.13), this is recognized by some Pkt. grammarians, according to Hemacandra, as a nom. sg. ending. We find it so recorded in our texts, tho the editors generally tend to emend it (and probably the more careless ones often emended silently). I regard it as the acc. masc. or alternating MIndic nom.-acc. nt. ending used as nom. masc. and fem. (otherwise Pischel, see § 10.13). My examples are chiefly from LV (mostly verses) and Mv. All concern short *i*-stems, mostly fem. — *na cāsti tṛptiṃ* LV 49.16 (end of pāda; metr. indifferent); *araṇiṃ yatha cottarāraṇiṃ* 177.1 (v.l. for both °*raṇi*, but this is unmetr.); *udyāna-bhūmim* (nom.; Tib. represents *udyānam*, omitting *bhūmi*, which however all Lefm.'s mss. have) *upaśobhitaṃ* 187.12 (prose); read *bhāvitā nitya kṣāntiṃ* 196.5 (with nearly all mss.; Lefm. *kṣānti* with 1 ms.; end of line); *nāsti te bhayam apāya durgatiṃ* 237.2; *(labhyate ...) bodhim uttama*° 287.18, all mss. and Calc.; meter requires long final, hence Lefm. em. *bodhī ut*°; rather read *bodhiṃ ut*°? (cf. §§ 2.69, 70); *muñjamuṣṭim iva* (nom.) 334.6; *triṃśatiṃ ca malināni* 372.5. — *taṃ ... mūlapraṇidhiṃ* Mv i.45.8 (prose); *dvitīyapraṇidhiṃ tadāsi* 54.3 (prose; all mss.; Senart em. *dvitīyo praṇidhi*; the word is definitely fem. in 54.6, 7); *eṣāṃ ca... praṇidhiṃ satatasamitā abhūṣi* 61.2 (prose), 'and this vow was eternal'; so all mss., Senart em. *eṣā ... praṇidhi*; *caturaśītiṃ* 117.2 (end of line of verse); *caturāśītiṃ* (§ 19.35) 119.5; *na ca taṃ vyādhiṃ pratiprasrabhyati* 253.10 (prose), 'and the disease did not abate' (no v.l.; kept by Senart; parallels in same context noms., and no other construction is possible); *tehi taṃ prakṛtiṃ sarvaṃ ācikṣitaṃ* 355.2 (prose); read with mss. *rātriṃ ca prabhātā* (v.l. °*tāye*) ii.108.7 (prose); *smṛtiṃ abhūṣi* 264.10 (prose; so read with mss.); *-guptiṃ* iii.329.11 etc., see Dict. s.v. *gupti* for others. — *taṇḍulaphalaśāliṃ* Divy 216.8–9 (prose; kept in ed.).

10.24. Neuter. As in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 85, Pischel 377, 379), *-iṃ* may replace the regular Skt. *-i*, sometimes but not always when meter requires a long syllable. — *vāriṃ* SP 127.8; *pūtiṃ ca vaktraṃ* 352.11 (in these may be m.c.). — *puruṣakāramatiṃ (kulaṃ)* LV 24.7; prose; so mss. (Lefm. em. °*mati*); also identical passage Mv i.198.1 and ii.1.12; *ardharātriṃ* LV 210.2 (prose), cf. Pali *aḍḍharatti*, which is fem. in the only unambiguous passage recorded in CPD. — *aśuciṃ* Divy 409.16 (prose; kept in ed. with mss.; in 409.1 *aśuci*).

10.25. Nom. sg. -īm? *bhūtakoṭīm akoṭīṃ ca* (but some mss. °*koṭim*, which is equally possible metrically, and *akoṭiṃ*) LV 437.1 (vs). Note also in Mv i.66.21 (vs) *prāñjalīṃ*, three mss., for (text with one ms.) °*lī* (v. l. °*li*, °*liṃ*); in Mv ii.280.6 (prose) *bhūmī adhi*°, Senart, but mss. *bhūmi adhi*° or *bhūmīm adhi*° (the latter perhaps with 'Hiatus-bridging' *m*?).

10.26. Nom. sg. -ī. In Skt. regular for masc. *in*-stems and fem. polysyllabic *ī*-stems; here used in what in Skt. are *i*-stems, masc. and fem. (Skt. nom. *-is*), as well as in fem. (and even masc.) stems which in Skt. have *-īs*; and in neuter *in*-stems, perhaps by transfer from masc. *in*-stems. In prose rare except in Mv. But, altho other texts present such forms wholly or chiefly in verses, meter can hardly motivate most of them, unless in the sense that short *-i* would usually spoil the meter. Before consonants and when final in a line, the normal Skt. *-is* (*-iḥ*, *-ir*, etc.) would give the same prosodic result, as would Skt. *-īs* always. However I know of no reason for supposing that short *-i* was any more 'original' as a nom. sg. ending in our dialect, even of *i*-stems, than *-ī*, the usual Prakrit ending.

10.27. Masc. *i*-stems. *yāvān avīcī* SP 9.5; *maharṣī* 89.11, 293.3 (end of pāda, followed by consonant); *pūtī* (... *gandhaḥ*) 95.7; *kṛpābuddhī ca prāṇiṣu* 343.6. — *praṇidhī* LV 161.19; *nṛpatī* 198.18; *maharṣī* 231.13; *namucī* 302.21. — *avīcī* (v.l. °*ciṃ*) Mv i.26.17; *lecchavī* 255.9, 256.7; *kulapatī* 273.10; *diśāṃpatī* iii.204.8; *aṅgulī* 358.2 (all prose). Verses: *narādhipatī* i.109.7, etc. — *ślakṣṇachavī (kāyaḥ)* RP 51.5. — *cyutyupapattī* (v.l. °*ti*) Bhad 16, 'having (attaining) rebirth thru fall', nom. sg. masc. (? but possibly loc., *in falls and rebirths*; so Leumann translates; § 10.68). — *Śivī* (before consonant) Laṅk 251.9 (prose).

10.28. Fem. *i*-stems. *-raśmī prasṛtā* SP 16.1; *raśmī vipulā* 16.2; *ca ratī ca* (v.l. *caratīva*) 87.6; *udyāna-bhūmī* 96.11 (at end of same line °*bhūmiḥ*); *ṛddhī* 161.13 (followed by *iyam*); *adhimuktī* 235.10; etc. — *nirvṛtī* LV 38.1; *durgatī* 196.4; *dharmaratī sada tasya ratīhā* (= *ratir iha*), *dhyānaratī amṛtārtharatiś ca* 313.10; *vṛddhī* 398.19, etc. — *āṇattī* Mv ii.95.8; *bhūmī* 171.9 (v.l. °*miṃ*); *prajñaptī* 273.12; iii.297.8; *aratī* iii.281.15; 284.12; 285.5; *āhutī* 426.16, all prose. Verses: *kīrtī* ii.225.5, etc.

10.29. *ī*-stems which in Skt. have nom. sg. in *-īs*. That is, monosyllabic stems and *lakṣmī*. Nearly all fem.; occasionally masc. compounds ending in *-śrī*, viz. *Śyāmakaśirī* Mv ii.218.6 (prose), *Mañjuśirī* Bhad 55. Feminines: *lakṣmī* LV 129.21, 130.5; *śrī* 130.18, 21; *hirī* (= *hrīḥ*) 158.20; *-śirī* (= *-śrīḥ*) 222.18 (only in verses). — *śirī* Mv ii.91.4 (vs); *śrī* (followed by vowel) iii.10.15 (prose).

10.30. *-ī* as fem. of *in*-stems, for Skt. *-inī*. Rare, but there are a few seemingly unquestionable cases. They are to be understood as extensions of the masc. ending to the fem., due to the regular identity of the two in *i* and *ī* stems in our dialect (and assimilation of *in*-stems to *i*-stems). — *dhyānasukha-samaṅgī* (as one word; there is no stem *-samaṅga* in normal use; here fem.) LV 56.20 (vs); *sākṣī* (both fem., for *sākṣiṇī*) 340.14 and 341.2. — *balabalī āśā* Divy 134.20 (prose; but reading and interpretation both uncertain).

10.31. *-ī* in nt. *in*-stems. Not common; sometimes determined by meter. The same occurs in Pali (Geiger 85.3) and Pkt. (Pischel 377, 379; cf. 358, where *ī* in nt. *i*-stems is assumed to mean change to fem. gender, to my mind an absurd interpretation). — *sukhī sarvaṃ yathā jagat* LV 97.5 (in an anuṣṭubh verse, but can hardly be called m.c.; *sarvaṃ* guarantees neuter gender); *veśmaṃ na śobhī* 231.3 (here m.c.). — *achandagāmī ca taṃ kulaṃ bhavati, adoṣagāmī ca amohagāmī ca abhayagāmī ca* Mv ii.1.10 f. (prose), mss.; Senart em. all to °*gāmi*, which is read in i.197.20 f., but the last two forms show there a v.l. °*gāmī*. The LV parallel 24.1–3 has °*gāminaṃ*; see § 10.3.

10.32. Nom. sg. -īs, from i-stems. Only in verses and rare. The only certain cases seem to have *-īr* for *-ir* m.c., before initial vowel. Masculine: *devarṣīr asito* LV 108.11. Feminine: *no ca tṛptīr abhūt* LV 215.8 and 17. Doubtful is *apāyabhūmīs tada utsadāsi* SP 170.1; so Nep. mss.; Kashgar rec. °*bhūmi sada*°, which is unmetrical (intending *bhūmīs tada*?); KN em. *bhūmī*, which WT keep without note.

Vocative singular

10.33. Voc. sg. -i. This, the Skt. ending of the *devī* declension, is used in the voc. of masc. *i* and *in* stems; in most texts only in verses, and at least usually where meter requires a short; but in Mv in metrically indifferent positions and in prose.

10.34. Masc. *i*-stems (the fact that my collectanea happen to show no fem. *i*-stems with this ending can certainly only be accidental; fem. proper names more often have stems in *-ī*, and hence regular Skt. vocs. in *-i*): *nṛpati* LV 56.7; 57.1; 95.3; 114.19; *narapati* 165.8; *muni* 360.2 (separate *mudita*); *atidyuti smṛtimati* 361.19

(both masc., the latter according to Tib. cpd. of *smṛti* and *mati*, 'having mentality characterized by *smṛti*'); *mahāmuni* 414.1. — *gṛhapati* Mv i.37.11; 245.6; ii.272.11; *dharmaruci* i.246.6; *nṛpati* ii.145.9; *sārathi* 152.15; *yūthapati* 254.4; *upāli* iii.180.5 (all prose). Verses (but often in places indifferent as to meter) *bhūmipati* Mv i.180.2; *mahābuddhi* 191.7 (masc., not required by meter; note *mahādyute* in preceding line); *maharṣi* ii.337.12 (end of a line); etc. — *mahāmuni* Suv 35.10. — *dānapati* RP 7.11.

10.35. Masc. *in*-stems: *-nighāti* LV 365.16; *svāmi* (so Lefm.; many mss. *svāmin*) 407.9 (prose). — *vararūpadhāri* Mv i.156.14 (v.l. °*dhārī*); *-gāmi* 157.3, 165.7 (in the second, v.l. *-gāmī*); *brahmacāri* ii.205.5; iii.419.5; *udāyi* iii.106.3 ff. (examples all from verses, but meter indifferent in most). — *Upāli* Divy 21.24 (prose; the stem in Divy is *upālin*, and the voc. *upālin* occurs elsewhere); *pakṣi* 476.14, 18 (prose).—(The regular Skt. ending *-in* may be written *-iṃ*, as in *-svāmiṃ* LV 243.7; this purely orthographic matter I ignore.)

10.36. Voc. sg.·-is (-ir), the nom. ending used as voc. Or should the following be interpreted as a case of ending *-i* plus 'hiatus-bridging' *r* (§§ 4.61 f.)? There may be others but I have failed to record any. Use of nom. forms as voc. is, in itself, nothing unusual. *nṛpatir adya* LV 41.14 (vs).

10.37. Voc. sg. -ī. Occurs from stems of all types, as in Prakrit, but chiefly in verses; in Mv also in prose.

10.38. Masc. *i*-stems: *maharṣe* SP 162.12, text with Kashgar rec.; but Nep. mss. *maharṣī*. — *vṛttakaṭī* LV 235.2 (stem °*kaṭi*; masc.); *svacarī* 360.3 (?), but this may be nom.; I have assumed that it is a cpd. of the noun *cari* (see Dict.), but it might stand for *-cārin* (*ă* shortened m.c.).

10.39. Masc. *in*-stems: *lokahitānukampī* SP 62.5 (end of pāda). — *achambhī* LV 284.18; *pramocī* 285.2.

10.40. Masc. *ī*-stems (cpds. of monosyllabic *ī*-stems which in separate occurrence are fem.): text *mañjuśrīḥ* (voc.) SP 8.5 (prose), but five Nep. mss. *mañjuśrī*; *mañjuśirī* 8.10 (so ed.; Nep. mss. *mañjuśrī*, Kashgar Rec. °*śiri*, both metr. deficient); *mañjuśirī* 11.9.

10.41. Fem. *ī*-stems: *devī* LV 91.21. — *devī* Mv i.131.3; 218.3 = ii.20.2 (all verses); ii.432.7 (prose; no v.l.); also iii.12.2, in a verse, but here *devi* would be metrically better; *kiṃnarī* ii.97.17 (end of line of vs, not m.c., no v.l.); *bhaginī* iii.69.8 (prose, no v.l.); *gautamī* 256.15 (prose, no v.l.).

Accusative singular

10.42. Acc. sg. -im. (Optionally before vowels, otherwise *-iṃ*.) The Skt. ending of short *i*-stems, occurs here also in *ī*-stems of all types and in masc. *in*-stems.

10.43. Masc. *in*-stems. In verses of most texts, and prose of Mv (also occasionally of Mmk). *amṛtagāmiṃ* (*dharmam*) LV 38.10; *-dhāriṃ* 132.21; *vyāpiṃ pradeśa gata* 336.22 (so divide; 'gone to an all-prevading [all-covering] place'); *praśāntagāmiṃ* 355.4 (v.l. °*gāmī*). — *śreṣṭhim* (before vowel) Mv i.37.11 (prose); *-nirghātiṃ* 113.4; *-vicāriṃ* 131.13 (prose); *śreṣṭhiṃ* 186.11; *vādiṃ* 186.14; *cakravartin* (followed by *ti*) 210.1 = ii.13.21 (prose; but in i.210.3 = ii.14.2, a verse, the mss. read *cakravartī*, or unmetrically °*ti*; Senart em. °*tiṃ*); *-samaṅgiṃ* i.210.2 (= ii.14.1, where however mss. °*ṅgi*; end of line, indifferent metrically); *upajīviṃ* 279.18; *bhuktāviṃ* 312.15; 325.13 (both prose); *pūrvopakārim* (before vowel) ii.180.1 (prose); *svāmiṃ* (v.l. *svāmi*; before vowel) 246.16 (prose); *dvīpiṃ* 411.2 (prose; so read with mss.; Senart em. *dvīpīṃ*, as acc. pl.); *hastiṃ* iii.41.18 (prose), etc. — *hastim* (before vowel) Mmk 24.15 (prose); *Ratnaśikhiṃ* 63.22. — *vihāriṃ* Gv 212.9 (end of verse); *arthim* 411.25 (before vowel; 2d ed. *artham*). — *alpabhāṇiṃ* Ud xxix.55(45) (for °*bhāṇinaṃ*; the vs = Pali Dhp. 227 where *mitabhāṇinaṃ*, which is hypermetric).

10.44. *ī*-stems. Usually fem. and polysyllabic; also *śiriṃ* (e. g. Mv i.276.14, end of line of verse) = *śriyam*, from *śrī*; and in masculine bahuvrīhis ending in originally fem. *ī*-stems, as *madhuravāṇiṃ* (sc. *bodhisattvaṃ*) LV 294.18 'sweet-voiced' (to *vāṇī*). Otherwise, in verses and Mv prose: *pāramiṃ gato* SP 451.5. — *devim* Mv i.218.7 = ii.20.6 (before vowel); *vaiśāliṃ* i.258.6, 10 (prose); *vārāṇasiṃ* (twice) 287.12 (prose); *ceṭiṃ* ii.169.17 (prose); *aṣṭamiṃ caturdaśi* (or °*śī*, mss.; Senart em. °*śiṃ*) *pañcadaśi* (so mss., Senart em. °*śiṃ*; but cf. § 10.51) 424.20 (prose); *sunakhiṃ vā śṛgāliṃ vā* 483.15; *prajāpatiṃ* iii.9.2 (so read with mss.; 'queen'); *nāriṃ* 41.20; etc. — *sarasvatiṃ* Bhad 30 (before vowel); *amitābhapuriṃ* 62 (before cons.; for °*purīṃ*; so also Gv 548.2). — *pañcamim* Dbh.g. 20(356).11, 15; *aṣṭamim* 38(64).16 (all three before vowels).

10.45. Neuter *i*-stems: *vāriṃ* SP 128.13 and LV 234.4 (both may be m.c.). — *asthiṃ* (several mss. *asthi*) Mv i.20.1 (prose); *surabhiṃ* (adverb) *pravānti* 294.5, 7 'smell fragrant' (here could be m.c.). — *śuciṃ* (. . . *khādanīyaṃ*) Divy 64.25 (prose); so mss.; ed. em. *śuci* (which is read 66.4). — *asthiṃ bhaṅktvā* Kv 69.17 (prose).

10.46. Neuter *in*-stems: *khagapathe-gāmiṃ gajavararatanaṃ* Mv i.108.16 and *-keśariṃ*. . . *turagaratanaṃ* 17–18; both acc. sg.

10.47. Acc. sg. -i. As in the nom., common in the verses of all texts and in all types of inflexion; rare in prose outside of Mv. (Prose passages will be so marked.)

10.48. Masc. *i*-stems: *anusaṃdhi* SP 394.1; *pāṇi* (v.l. *pāṇiṃ*, unmetr.) LV 74.22; *praṇidhi* Mv i.112.4 (with adj. *paraṃ*); *muni* ii.335.2 (required by meter; Senart wrongly em. *muniṃ*); *śāli* RP 27.4, 6, 9.

10.49. Masc. *in*-stems: *vighāti* (= *vighātinaṃ*) *vaidyottamaṃ* LV 91.21; mss. *bhuktāvi* or °*vī* (Senart em. °*viṃ*) Mv i.38.8 (prose); *samaṅgi* ii.14.1 (end of line of verse; Senart em. °*iṃ* with i.210.2); in ii.246.16 (prose) v.l. *svāmi* (text °*iṃ*); *dharmasvāmi* (= °*svāminaṃ*) RP 7.12.

10.50. Fem. *i*-stems: *bodhi* SP 35.1; 194.9; *caturaśīti dhārayet* 254.11 (so read with most mss. and WT; KN unmetrical); *durgati* 314.3; etc. — *prīti vetsyāmaḥ* LV 60.21 (prose); Lefm. as one word!; only one ms. with Calc. *prītiṃ*; not noted by Weller; *cari* 161.21 (read *cari purimāṃ*); 164.16; *saṃgīti* 193.12; *śānti* 287.4; etc. — *pārṣṇi* Mv i.6.4; 17.10 (prose; before vowel); *bhūmi* (mss.; Senart em. °*iṃ*) 136.4 (prose); *yoni* (mss.; Senart em. *yoniṃ*) 144.3 (prose); etc. — *bodhi* Bhad 10; *nirvṛti* 11. — *bodhi* Gv 54.1; *gati* 54.24; *cari* 57.17; etc. — *-cari* RP 32.18.

10.51. Polysyllabic fem. *ī*-stems: *mahi* SP 96.5 (= *mahīm*); *medini* (= °*nīm*) 394.4; etc. — *tūli* LV 75.1; *mahi* 165.10; 167.7 (167.7 also *sanagari*); *nadi* 271.12, 14; etc. — *girinadi* Mv ii.222.4; *vasumati* 342.2, 8; 344.2. In all these meter proves mss. (there is sometimes an unmetrical v.l. °*tī*) correct; Senart em. *-iṃ*. In i.42.8, 53.9 meter proves *dharmabheri* the only possible reading; mss. mostly °*bherī*, Senart °*bherīṃ*. There are other such cases; the copyists, and Senart after them, seem to have gagged at admitting the acc. sg. ending *-i* in *ī*-stems even more often than in *i*-stems; but there is no doubt whatever about both. See also ii.424.20, above, § 10.44. — *pañcami* Dbh.g. 20(356).7 (= °*mīm*, before vowel; in same phrase below, lines 11, 15, *pañcamim*).

10.52. Monosyllabic *ī*-stems: *śiri* Mv ii.353.11 (mss., supported by meter; Senart *śiriṃ*). Same form in mss. ii.379.2 and 22, before a vowel (so that it and Senart's em. *śirim* are metrically equivalent).

10.53. Acc. sg. -y. May occur for *-i* as acc. sg., before a vowel, to suit metrical convenience: *māyādevy* (read *māya*° m.c.) *abruvan* LV 91.16; *aprāpya bodhy utthihet* 284.6; *sarvavyādhy apanesi* 363.5.

10.54. Acc. sg. -ī. As in the nom.; not so common here, but occurs even in a masculine *in*-stem, as well as in feminines (cf. under *-īm* below): *cakravartī* Mv i.210.3 = ii.14.2, mss., should be kept (v.l. °*ti* is unmetrical; Senart em. °*tiṃ*).

10.55. The rest are from fem. stems, and (probably by accident) I seem to have recorded only *ī*-stems, or at least no forms which would necessarily be *i*-stems in Skt. Rare in prose except in Mv. *kaṭasī ca vardhenti* SP 48.4 (Pali *kaṭasiṃ vaḍḍhenti*, see Dict. s.v. *kaṭasī*); *buddhanetrī kṣipi* 94.12; *tṛṣitāṃ dharaṇī* (all mss., both edd. em. °*ṇīṃ*) *tarpet* 126.14. — *yasavatī* LV 50.4; *kṛṣī karoti* 133.17 (stem normally *kṛṣi*, but *kṛṣī* also occurs in Skt.); *śuṣka-nadī* 174.10 (Lefm. em. °*īṃ*); (?) *-viśeṣaṇāsadṛśī lokādhipateyatāṃ* 179.20 (prose; so all mss.; Lefm. prints as cpd. with next word, which may be right, § 23.8; Weller 28 separates); *īdṛśī vibhūtiṃ* 316.7 (no v.l.); *medinī* 357.14; *maitrī bhāventi* 375.19; *ratnapātrī* 387.4 (Lefm. em. °*īṃ*). — *divyalaṅkāpurī ramyāṃ* Laṅk 5.12 (in ed. printed as cpd.; acc. of goal, 'let the Buddha come to . . .', cf. line 18 below). — *caranti dharaṇī* Mv i.79.4 (no v.l.); *sūcī* ii.87.12, 88.6 (no v.l.; could be plur.); *dharmanetrī* 373.5; °*bhirūpāṃ strī* (Senart em. *strīm*) *ātmānam* . . . iii.291.2 (prose). — *strī* RP 25.2; 29.10.

10.56. Acc. sg. -īm. The regular ending of the *devī* declension, here found also with *i*-stems (and not only m.c.; even in prose), not only fems., but masc. *i* and *in* stems. Cf. Epic Skt. *prātikāmīm* (stem *prātikāmin*) Mbh. 2.60.1c (Crit. ed.). When followed by a vowel, *-īm* is sometimes required by meter rather than *-im* (but *-iṃ* would always have the like result metrically, §§ 2.69–70).

10.57. Masc. *i*-stem: *añjalīṃ pragṛhya* (all mss.; both edd. em. °*liṃ*) SP 161.4 (prose). — *añjalīṃ pragṛhītvāna* (no v.l.) Mv ii.308.6.

10.58. Masc. *in*-stem: *kṛkīṃ* (or *kṛkī*, mss.; stem *kṛkin*; Senart em. *kṛkiṃ*) *kāśirājānam* Mv i.324.3 (prose).

10.59. Fem. *i*-stems: *-bhūmīm* SP 68.7 (before vowel; m.c.); *bodhīm* 96.8 (before vowel; m.c.); *dṛṣṭīṃ* 204.4 (before consonant; all mss.). — *-bhūmīm* Mv ii.150.6 (prose; before vowel; no v.l.). The stem *bhūmī* seems to be Vedic only, at least not Classical. In Mv i.102.6 and 8 we also find *bhūmīṃ*, before consonant (but v.l. °*iṃ*); cf. *bhūmīṣv* i.102.9. In i.105.7 (prose) Senart also reads *bhūmīṃ*, but by em.; mss. *bhūmī* or *bhūmiṃ*. — *ratīm* (before vowel; m.c.) Samādh 19.26 (vs).

10.60. Acc. sg. -is (-ir, etc.), the nom. sg. used as acc. Rare. (*amara*) *muñciṣu kusumavṛṣṭiḥ* LV 217.1 (so ed.; vs, printed as prose; all mss. *-iḥ* or *-ir*, before *j*-; only Calc. *-iṃ*), can only be acc. sg.; *girir iva acalaṃ* 329.20 (here *-r-* may be taken as 'hiatus-bridger', after *giri*, acc. sg.); *buddhākoṭi-sahasra caikanavatiḥ pūrvaṃ smarāmī ahaṃ* 402.13 (seems the most likely reading; 'I remember 91 thousand crores of Buddhas of old'; the number is confirmed by Tib.; Lefm. with v.l. *naikanavati*, bad in sense and in meter, since the last syllable must be long).

10.61. Acc. sg. -īnam. For *-inam* as acc. sg. of a stem in *-in*; isolated and m.c. *sukuṇḍalīnam* (= °*linam*, m.c.) Suv 246.7 'having fair ear-rings'.

10.62. Acc. sg. -iya, m.c. for *-iyam* in monosyllabic *ī*-stem. *śriya* (= *śriyaṃ*) *kriyam atulām* (most mss.) LV 361.18.

10.63. Acc. sg. -iyaṃ. The ending of monosyllabic *ī*-stems in Skt., transferred to polysyllabic *ī* and *i*-stems. *janetriyaṃ* Mv i.199.8 (acc. sg. to *janetrī* = *janayitrī* 'mother'; the parallel ii.3.6 has *janetriyaḥ*, acc. pl.); *-śreṇiyaṃ* (v.l. *śreṇīyaṃ*) Mv iii.68.6 (prose), to *śreṇi* 'row, series'.

Oblique cases of the singular

10.64. Wh reas in the nom., acc. and voc. forms there is very little trace of distinction between genders, less than between original Sanskrit *i* and *ī* declensional types, in the oblique cases gender is quite as important as between masc.-neut. *a*-stems and fem. *ā*-stems. There is, to be sure, some confusion, as there is between *a*- and *ā*-stems; but it is clearly sporadic; on the whole, masc.-neut. nouns on the one hand, and fem. nouns on the other, go their separate ways. We shall accordingly treat them separately, in general. There are, however, some forms which seem to belong equally to both. To the latter class belong genitives in *-e* for *-eḥ*, and various oblique case forms in *-i*, *-ī*; datives in *-ayi*, m.c. for *-aye*; perhaps ablatives in *-ito* or the like (but see § 10.133); and a doubtful locative in *-yau* (probably only an error for *-au*).

Oblique sg. case forms common to all genders

10.65. Oblique sg. -i and -ī. Apparently the endingless stems are used for various oblique singular cases (instr., abl., loc.). Cf. the use of forms in *-a* from *a*-stems, §§ 8.3 ff. (I should certainly *not* connect such forms with Vedic instrumentals and locatives in *ī*.) While not numerous, the cases seem, in part, hardly subject to doubt. They occur mostly in verses; Mv prose occurrences do not clearly decide whether *-i* or *-ī* (or both) should be regarded as the basic ending, the other being (possibly) a change motivated by metrical requirements. The following are the most likely cases noted; all from verses except those stated to be prose. (Cf. also *-iṃ*, § 10.75.)

10.66. Instrumental: *sadṛśo 'sti na te kutottare* (so read) *śīlasamādhi tathaiva prajñayā* LV 364.18, 'no one is like you, much less superior, in morality, concentration, and also wisdom.' No v.l. for *samādhi*; *śīla* may also be taken as a separate word in the same construction, which *prajñayā* seems to define as instr.; *prakṛti* (no v.l.) *imi nirātma sarvadharmāḥ* 393.12, 'all these states of being are self-less by nature.' — *vaśavartti* (v.l. °*tī*) *ca devaputreṇa* Mv i.230.13 (prose). So mss.; certainly instr. of a masc. *in*-stem; Senart em. to *vaśavartinā*. — In Mv i.298.20 (vs) read with mss. *mahājano prīti* ('with affection'; Senart em. *prīto*, unmetr.) *karoti puṇyaṃ*.

10.67. Ablative: *nāgakanyāhaṃ bhadraṃ te avīcī iha āgatā* Mv ii.181.11, 'I am a *nāga*-girl, bless you!, come here from the nether world.' In a verse, but the syllable *-ī* could be either long or short; the stem is normally *avīci*, and masculine.

10.68. Locative: *pāṇi gṛhītvana* LV 114.18, 'taking in (or 'with', instr.?) the hand' (object accus. in preceding line); two mss. *pāṇī*, which is unmetrical; Calc. interprets by *pāṇau*; *na ca utthitu āsani no ca bhumī* (so Calc. and Lefm., m.c., for mss. *bhūmī*) 155.11, 'and he did not arise in his seat nor on the ground'; *āsani* is certainly loc., and *bhumī* (for *bhūmī*) must apparently be loc. if it is the true text; however, Foucaux (Notes 130) assumes that the true reading was *yamī* = (*ā*)*yamī* 'making an effort', on the basis of Tib. brtsol ba ma mchis su 'not making an effort'; *nidhi dṛṣṭa* (one ms. and Calc. *dṛṣṭi*) *yathā hi palāyati koci naro* 323.11, 'as some man might run away when a treasure was seen'; unless we em. to *dṛṣṭva* (ger., 'having seen a treasure'), it seems necessary to assume a loc. absolute; *dṛṣṭa* may be kept, as loc. (§ 8.11); *ṛṣipatanam upetya vārāṇasī vartito* 421.16, '(by the Buddha) going to Ṛṣip. (the wheel of the law) has been turned at Benares'; so Tib., clearly and plausibly; it would be implausible to take *vārāṇasī* as a second acc. with *upetya*, as supplement to *ṛṣipatanam*. — Possibly Bhad 16 (§ 10.27).

10.69. Nearly a score of times the Mv has (in prose) a formulaic phrase printed by Senart as follows: *nagare vārāṇasī kāśijanapade* (i.271.19; 286.22; ii.48.16; 64.14; 67.19; 77.5; 82.7; 177.9; 209.9; 241.13; 250.20; 420.6; iii.33.11; 143.11; 286.16; list is not complete). The variant *vārāṇasi*, with short final vowel, occurs in one or another

ms. in quite a number of these cases. The meaning seems certain: 'in the city (of) Benares, in the Kāśi country'. Without emendation, it seems scarcely possible to avoid taking *vārāṇasī* (or °*si*) as loc. sg. And *kāśi* might be interpreted in the same way, tho the fact that it precedes *janapade* makes it possible with Senart to regard it as part of a cpd.

10.70. Dat. sg. -ayi, only m.c. for *-aye*. The form *bodhayi*, for *bodhaye*, occurs in verses LV 392.2; Bhad 12; Gv 488.8; Śikṣ 4.8 and 9 (cited from Ratnolkādhāraṇī).

10.71. Abl. sg. -ito; for this (mostly from fem. stems, a few from stems which are at least normally masc.), see § 10.133.

10.72. Gen. sg. -e: for the gen. *-es* (*-eḥ*, *-er* etc.), the mss. sometimes write *-e*, and are (hesitatingly and not consistently) followed by the editions. It is, indeed, possible that lack of the final visarga is only a corruption of tradition; yet it could be interpreted as normal MIndic phonology, tho gens. sg. in *-e* seem not to be recorded in Geiger or Pischel for Pali or Pkt. A few examples: *nṛpate* LV 114.2 (before *bh-*; one ms. and Calc. °*ter*); *tasyā mune* 422.5 (before *v-*; here Lefm. and Calc. *mune*, but best ms. *muner*). — *laṅkādhipate* Laṅk 9.12 (prose; before *p-*). — (*mahā-*)*mune* Mv i.65.13; 66.18; 67.12, 18; 68.1, 15; iii.380. 11; *bhūme* i.70.18 (mss.); *-adhipate* iii.440.17.

10.73. Gen. sg. -yus from stem *-patī*, f. (as if imitating *pati*, m., in mg. 'husband', Wh. Gr. 343d): *Mahāprajāpatyur haste* MSV ii.144.17 (prose).

10.74. Loc. sg. -yau for -au? I.e. blend of *-au* and *-yām*? Probably to be excluded; only SP 370.4 (prose) where KN *ye cādhastād avīcyāv ūrdhvaṃ ca*. But apparently only one ms. reads *avīcyāv* (tho WT keep it without note). Observe also that *avīci* is, at least normally, masc. Probably *avīcāv* (or with v.l. *avīci-pūrvam*?) should be read. The Kashgar recension is not cited in the note.

10.75. Loc. sg. -iṃ. Assumed as loc., *avīciṃ* Mv i.26.14, 16 (prose) and *aṣṭamābhūmiṃ* i.107.7, Senart i note p. 391, citing Kaccāyana ii.1.18 (*ādiṃ*, *bārāṇasiṃ*). Cf. the ending *i*, *ī* §§ 10.65 ff.

Distinctively masculine-neuter forms, not normal Skt.

10.76. Inst. sg. -ina, only m.c. for *-inā*: *agnina* SP 85.11; *nṛpatina* LV 166.5; *pāṇina-m-asiṃ* LV 338.12 (with 'hiatus-bridging' *m*); *vyādhina* Śikṣ 330.6 (cited from Ratnolkādhāraṇī).

10.77. Inst. sg. -īnā, only m.c. for *-inā*. Cf. AMg. forms like *aṭṭhīṇa* (Pischel 379): *daṇḍakīnā* Mv iii.365.16.

10.78. Gen. sg. -isya, as in Pali and Pkt. *-issa*. Much commoner in Mv than anywhere else; in other texts only in verses and infrequently. Only with masc. and nt. stems; possibly a solitary fem. is *sāhaṃjanisya* Mv iii.151.4 (v.l. °*īsya*), a name of a locality. Even when applied to compounds ending in monosyllabic *ī*-stems which when uncompounded are fem., the cpds. are masc.: *rāhulaśirisya* Mv i.128.13; *śyāmakaśirisya* ii.215.7, 13 etc.; *kāśyapaśirisya* iii.244.7. Occurs alike with *i-* and *in*-stems, which I have tried to list separately, but the distinction is sometimes impossible and always factitious in this dialect. Occasionally we find, at least in the mss., the Sanskritizing form *-iṣya*, but it is doubtful whether it has any real standing. In Samādh 19.36 *namuciṣya* is printed, but perhaps only by misprint; it is cited as *namucisya* p. 18. In Mv i.253.11 the mss. read *maskariṣya*, in 305.8 *kṛkiṣya* (but *kṛkisya* 303.5, 7; 305.2), in ii.153.2 *vyādhiṣya*, and in iii.76.13 *keśiṣya*; Senart em. always to *-sya*, probably rightly.

10.79. *i*-stems: *vārisya* SP 126.3; *lokādhipatisya* 313.4; 331.8. — *śākyamunisya* Mv i.47.15; *gṛhapatisya* 245.5; *lecchavisya* 257.14, 16; *vārisya* 308.4; *kanakamunisya* 318.13; *śālisya* 343.19; *ṛṣisya* ii.31.13, 15, etc.; *vardhakisya* 466.3; *upālisya* iii.179.10 ff. (all prose); etc., common; and equally common in verses, e. g. *vajrapāṇisya* i.183.10; *dṛḍhamatisya* iii.355.12; *śucisya* 418.8. — *kācamaṇisya* KP 91.7.

10.80. *in*-stems: *śreṣṭhisya* Mv i.36.8; 44.10 etc.; *samitāvisya* 49.9 etc.; *bhuktāvisya* ii.116.14; *-samoṅgisya* 178.16; *vipaśyisya* 271.10; *vijitāvisya* iii.47.9; *śikhisya* 94.1; *kālodāyisya* 103.9; *brahmacārisya* 163.17; *aśvakisya* 337.5 (all prose), etc., common. — *ratnaśikhisya* Suv 146.8; 152.10.

10.81. Gen. sg. -inaḥ, -ino. The regular ending of *in*-stems, applied here to masc. *i*-stems, as in Pali-Pkt., and to neuters in Skt. Cf. *-unas*, *-uno* with *u*-stems, § 12.2. Strangely, there is one prose instance in the Divy: *śucinaḥ* 237.21 (adj., with *āhārasya*). Even more strangely, all the other cases I have noted are only from verses—even those of Mv; if Mv prose uses the form I have failed to note an example. The form *-ino* is generally used without regard to saṃdhi, and even before a pause; but at the end of a line *-inaḥ* is found Mv i.219.8 (repeated with *-ino* ii.21.10) and ii.304.5. A cpd. ending in *-śrī* shows *kāśyapaśiriṇo* Mv iii.429.14. Other examples: *gṛhapatino* SP 113.1. — *narapatino* LV 230.5; *munino* 275.20; *namucino* 341.14. — *munino* Mv i.68.11; 167.18 etc.; *varabuddhino* 170.16; 208.17 = ii.11.5; i.215.7 = ii.18.4; *nṛpatino* i.199.17 (so read with mss., Senart °*nāṃ*); *maharṣiṇo* 251.7; 267.21; 304.13; iii.434.2; *amitabuddhino* i.314.18; *mahīpatino* ii.37.15; *ameyabuddhino* 44.14; *abuddhino* 409.5 (so with mss.; Senart *abuddhi*). — *munino* Mmk 594.3.

10.82. Loc. sg. -e. The ending of *a*-stems, transferred for the nonce; noted only in the phrase *avīce mahānarake* 'in the great hell Avīci' Mv i.230.5 = 240.15 (prose). In the parallels Mv i.41.10 and iii.341.17 *avīcismiṃ*. The form *mahānarake* has induced *avīce*.

10.83. Loc. sg. -esmiṃ. An ending of *a*-stems, occurs once in an *in*-stem; *vipaśyesmiṃ* Mv i.294.19, mss.; Senart emends to °*yismiṃ*, but there is no more reason for doing so than for emending to *avīcismiṃ* in the preceding.

10.84. Loc. sg. -ismiṃ. As in Pali (and cf. Pkt. *-iṃmi*, AMg *-iṃsi*), analogous to *-asmiṃ* (*-esmiṃ*) in the *a*-stems. Extremely rare except in Mv; indeed outside of that text I have noted only a case or two of the form *-ismi*, for which see next paragraph. In the form *-ismiṃ* it occurs in metrically indifferent situations and in prose; *-ismi* only occurs in verse where meter requires a short ultima (and not always then in the mss.).

From *in*-stems: *hastismiṃ* Mv ii.73.8 ff.; 423.16; 434.11; iii.184.7 (all prose); *kālodāyismiṃ* iii.103.7.

i-stems: *agnismiṃ* Mv i.6.1; iii.426.15 (prose), and i.14.6, 15.15 (vss); *avīcismiṃ* i.41.10; 337.5; ii.162.14 (prose) and i.42.16 (vs, end of line); *kukṣismiṃ* i.206.15; i.213.11 = ii.16.14; i.303.5; iii.404.5 (all prose) etc.; in i.207.10 = ii.11.21 (vs) meter demands short final, before a vowel, i. e. *kukṣismim* or °*smi*; the mss. read *kukṣi* the first time, *kukṣismiṃ* (adopted both times by Senart) the second; *-kanakamunismiṃ* i.294.20; *atithismiṃ* (before vowel; °*im* better metrically) ii.50.11 = 51.1 (vs); *-girismiṃ* iii.60.1; 441.15; 443.14 (all prose); *śākyamunismiṃ* iii.238. 10 (prose).

10.85. Loc. sg. -ismi, only in verses m.c., for the preceding: *ekamuṣṭismi* SP 253.13, Kashgar rec., La Vallée-Poussin, JRAS 1911.1072; edd. with Nep. *ekamuṣṭiṃ tu*, obviously a lect. fac., inferior as to syntax (depending on *nikṣipet*). — *samādhismi* Mv i.164.12; 165.1; *śākyamunismi* 294.21 (v.l. °*smiṃ*, but meter seems to require °*smi*). — *narakagatismi* Sukh 23.6 (probably bahuvrīhi, 'in (reference to) one that is subject to existence in hell', masc.).

Oblique singular feminine

10.86. In MIndic generally, all fem. *i* and *ī* stems standardly have endings which are common to all oblique

singular cases, and are roughly parallel to the corresponding endings of *ā*-stems: Pali *-iyā* (Geiger 86, 87); Pkt. *-īa*, *-īe*, less commonly *-īā*, *-īi* (Pischel 385, 386); of these *-īe* is 'die gewöhnliche Form in allen (Pkt.) Dialekten'. Forms with short *i* for *ī* also occur, at least in Ap. (ibid. 385, end). Pischel (386) also records the Ap. ending *-ī* (*-i*) for instr. and loc. (§§ 10.65 ff.), and certain special endings for particular cases. Pischel found no examples of *-īa*, *-īe* etc. for the ablative, but the Pkt. grammarians include that case with the others, and in our dialect it shows in general the same endings with the other cases (in addition to the distinctive *-īto*, *-ito*, which to be sure are commoner). The *i*, when short, before *y* may be considered epenthetic (§ 3.102).

10.87. Our dialect resembles MIndic in general, but is even more varied in the forms it presents. Our arrangement will follow the general lines of our statement of *ā*-stem forms. We shall begin with the ending *-īye* (cf. Pkt. *-īe*) and its congeners (*-iye*, *-iyi*). Then *-īya* (cf. Pali *-iyā*, Pkt. *-īa*, *-īā*) and its congeners (*-īyā*, *-iyā*, *-iya*); next *-īyo*, *-īyu*, *-iyo*, much rarer; next *-yā*, *-ya*; and finally various forms which fundamentally pertain to particular oblique cases, and are not (like the preceding) common to them all. We shall attempt to group the forms under each ending by cases, according to the apparent syntax; but there are many instances where the same form could be attributed to more than one case; the plain fact is that the formal distinction between the cases is obliterated in these categories.

10.88. All these endings appear to be applicable to all *feminine i* and *ī*-stems without distinction. The Skt. differences between the *gati*, *devī* and *śrī* types are not maintained. This is of course not meant to suggest that distinctive forms of those types do not occur in the texts, at least in our mss. and editions; it only means that, as far as non-Sanskritic forms are concerned, they seem to occur equally freely with all fem. types.

10.89. They even occur sporadically with stems which are, at least in Skt., masculine. This is part of the general blurring of gender-distinctions in MIndic as a whole. Some of the nouns in question have feminine forms in other MIndic dialects. Examples are *añjali*, m. in Skt. and Pali, but also fem. in AMg.; *vidhi*, not recorded as fem. in Skt., Pali, or Pkt., except that PTSD (not Childers) attributes fem. gender to it (but its citations do not support the allegation); *samādhi*, only m. in Skt. and acc. to Childers in Pali (PTSD gives no statement of gender), also in AMg. (Ratnach), but acc. to Sheth both m. and f. in Pkt.; *vyādhi*, m. in Skt., Pali, AMg., but in JM. (Jacobi, Ausgew. Erz., Glossary) *vāhi* also fem. Distinctively fem. forms of these stems are found in our texts: *añjaliya* (v.l. °*īya*, instr.) Mv ii.299.17; *añjalīyo* (Senart em. °*-īye*, instr.) Mv ii.395.15, 19; *vidhīye*, *vidhiye* Mv i.308.16; ii.2.14; ii.208.11; i.261.13; i.209.9 = ii.11.16; *samādhito* (? perhaps not to be considered fem. ending) SP 25.3; Mv ii.209.2; 241.2; *samādhīye* Mv i.160.13; *samādhiye* LV 60.4; *vyādhito* (? cf. under *samādhito*) Mv i.308.8; Suv 38.11.—There seems even to be an instr. *agnyā* from the indubitably masc. stem *agni* (§ 10.121). Here, certainly 'change of gender' is out of the question; it is rather adoption of an originally fem. ending in a masc. noun. — On *kukṣi* see § 10.100.

10.90. Obl. sg. -īye; -iye, -iyi. The last rare and only in verses m.c. In Mv, prose as well as verses, *-īye* is extremely common; indeed it seems to be the regular ending, far commoner than *-īya* (*-īyā*, etc.), and commoner also than *-iye*, tho this is by no means rare and occurs not infrequently in prose, so that the short *i* cannot be due solely to metrical requirements. Often Mv mss. vary between *-īye* and *-iye*. Both *-īye* and *-iye* are virtually limited to verses in other texts than Mv; note however a considerable list of forms in *-īye* (gen.) in prose Māy 226.15 ff., 244.33 ff. (On *-īyai*, dat., see § 10.131.)

10.91. -īye, Instr.: (*i*-stems) *kṣāntīye* LV 162.3; 164.5, 6; *śīlacarīye* 168.3 (or loc.?); (*ī*-stems) *maitrīye* 162.5 (. . . *sphuṭa*, 'filled with love'); *śirīye* 185.5—Mv, very common in prose and vss; examples from prose: (*i*-stems) *ṛddhīye* Mv i.35.3; 248.18, 20; iii.357.9 etc.; *prakṛtīye* i.238.6; *rājāṇattīye* 274.2; 350.2; ii.48.6; *aṅgulīye* i.339.10; *jātīye* ii.161.7; *saṃpattīye* 271.1; *dṛṣṭīye* iii.281.5, 6; *gatīye* 376.6; *buddhīye* 393.12 (v.l. °*iye*); (*ī*-stems) *vipākanīye*, *vipācanīye* (see Crit. App.), *grahaṇīye* i.211.6; ii.15.6; 424.3; *mahatīye* i.216.19 etc.; *mālinīye* 307.12 etc.; *mṛgīye* 363.7; iii.143.17 etc.; *kiṃnarīye* ii.97.11 etc.; *tādṛśīye lakṣmīye* 157.9; *brāhmaṇīye* 210.3; *devīye* 422.8 etc.— (*i*-stem) *smṛtīye* Gv 231.2; (*ī*-stem) *śirīye* 235.24.—Masc., or doubtful as to gender: *vidhīye* Mv i.308.16; ii.2.14; 208.11 (above).

10.92. -īye, Dat.: (*i*-stems) *-guptīye* Mv i.208.6 (prose); v.l. *guptaye*, which is read without v.l. in the parallel ii.10.18; but i.208.8, 9, 15, in modulations of the same phrase, have *-guptīye* without v.l.; *guptīye* (v.l. °*iye*) iii.48.12 (prose); in ii.256.10 *-vṛddhiye* and in ii.315.2 *-saṃbodhiye* are read by Senart, but v.l. °*īye* both times; both prose. — *-carīye* (*i*-stem) Bhad 42, 56.

10.93. -īye, Abl.: (*i*-stems) *bhittīye* (in prec. line *bhittīya*) Mv i.6.9 (prose); *bhūmīye* i.6.11 (prose; also v.l. of 3 mss. i.26.3, prose, where Senart °*iye* with 3 other mss.); (*ī*-stem) *vārāṇasīye* ii.180.8 (prose).

10.94. -īye, Gen.: (*i*-stems) *vimuktīye* Mv i.160.13 (prose); *bodhiyaṣṭīye* (v.l. °*ṭi*; intending °*ṭiye*? or to § 10.65?) ii.264.5 (prose); *ṛddhīye* (v.l. °*iye*; meter indifferent) iii.289.6; *bodhīye* 317.19 (prose); (*ī*-stems, all prose) *devīye* i.215.12; 217.6; 223.4 etc.; *puṣkaraṇīye* i.227.18; *gośṛṅgīye* 263.3; 271.14, 17; *vaiśālīye* 270.11; 283.7, 8 etc.; *ulūkīye*, *śukīye* 272.18; *mālinīye* 307.4, 6, 11 etc.; *gurviṇīye mṛgīye* 361.20; *strīye prajāyamānīye* iii.163.2; etc., very common. — *carīye* Bhad 45. — *sukhāvatīye* Sukh 45.9; 46.5. — *-samatīye* Māy 226.15 ff. (prose; read doubtless *-samitīye*, to *samiti* 'assembly', but repeated many times); *gaurīye* 244.33 ff. (prose), and a series of genitives (? datives) in *-īye*. — Masculine, or doubtful in gender: *samādhīye* Mv i.160.13.

10.95. -īye, Loc.: (*i*-stem) *nirvṛtīye* SP 198.10 (ed. with Nep. mss.; Kashgar rec. °*tīyā*; end of pāda; read *viśrānta jñātvāna ca nirvṛtīye* (or °*yā*), *sarvajñajñāne upanenti sarvān*, 'and knowing that they are rested, they lead all unto *nirvāṇa*, unto the Omniscient's knowledge'); (*ī*-stem) *koṭīsahasrāya* (loc.) *ca dhāraṇīye* 330.4, 'and in the magic formula which makes 1000 crores (of revolutions)', referring to SP 327.8 (misunderstood by Burnouf and Kern).—(*i*-stem) *ratīye* LV 169.9; (*ī*-stems) *lumbinīye* 81.8; *medinīye* 195.9; 368.16.—(*i*-stems) *-bhūmīye* Mv ii.45.5; 130.14 (prose); *rātrīye* ii.112.10; 167.7, etc.; *kṣāntīye* iii.360.17 (vs); *upapattīye* 404.11 (prose); (*ī*-stems, all examples chosen from prose) *dīpavatīye rājadhānīye* i.194.16; 199.19; 232.10; *vārāṇasīye* 325.16; 329.8; ii.167.6, 12; 176.18 etc.; *chādyamānīye* i.328.1, 16 (Senart em. °*āye*); *vuhyantīye* 342.15; *otarantīye* ii.101.11; *nadīye* 264.4; 302.7; iii.163.10; 166.6; *mahatīye* ii.282.10; *kaṃsapātrīye* 282.11; *devīye* 427.11; *padminīye* 448.18; *-bāhirīye* iii.298.1, 2; etc. — *dharaṇīye* Suv 230.4; 231.7. — *-dṛṣṭīye* (*i*-stem) KP 95.5 and 6 (prose). — *buddhabhūmīye* Gv 57.25 (printed °*mī ye*; *i*-stem). — *-bhūmīye* Māy 36.

10.96. -iye, Instr.: (*ī*-stem) *śiriye* LV 54.8 (= *śriyā*; both *ī* and *i* m.c.).—Mv, much less common than *-īye*; largely in verses, but also in prose: (*i*-stems) *ṛddhiye* Mv i.65.4 (vs); 216.18 (prose, v.l. °*īye*); ii.366.4 (vs, v.l. °*iyo*); iii.116.1 (prose, v.l. °*īye*); 303.14 (prose); 402.18 (prose; in some of these at end of cpds.); *buddhiye* i.68.16 (vs); ii.57.6 (vs); 447.5 (prose); *viparītāya dṛṣṭiye* i.101.12 (vs, so read, cf. Senart's note); *jātiye* ii.199.16 (vs); *kṣāntiye*

332.18 (vs); (ī-stems) *prakṛtiye* (to *prakṛtī*, fem. of ppp. *prakṛta*) i.238.3 (prose); *mṛgīye . . . amucyantiye* 363.7 (prose, no v.l.); *-paripūriye* ii.205.16 (vs, Senart em. °*yā*); *paryāhiṇḍantiye* iii.155.1 (prose); *striye* 296.7 (prose); *pauriye* 322.2 (prose); *icchantiye* 393.16.—(*i*-stem) *pratipattiye* RP 36.12.—(*i*-stem) *prītiye* Sukh 50.10.—Masculine, or doubtful as to gender: *vidhiye* Mv i.209.9 = ii.11.16 (here v.l. °*īye*; meter doubtful); i.261.13 (prose, no v.l.).

10.97. -iye, Dat.: (*i*-stems) *bodhiye upajanenti mānasam* Mv i.81.19 (vs), mss., to be kept; Senart em. *bodhaye*. An identical passage i.48.2 mss. *bodhāya* (one °*ye*), unmetr.; Senart em. *bodhaye*, but perhaps *bodhiye* may be the true reading here too. — *-vṛddhiye* (v.l. °*īye*) Mv ii.256.10 (prose); *-saṃbodhiye* (v.l. °*īye*) 315.2 (prose).

10.98. -iye, Abl.: (ī-stems) *chattrodgataṃ dharaṇiye* LV 196.21, 'a parasol sprung up out of the earth'; so Tib. definitely, *sa las* (abl.); *yasyā tejatu puṇyataś ca śiriye* 275.17 (the parallel nouns in *-tu*, *-taś* prove *śiriye* abl.). — *bhūmiye* (v.l. °*īye*) Mv i.26.3 (prose), *i*-stem.

10.99. -iye, Gen.: (*i*-stem) *rātriye* LV 236.1; (ī-stems) *deviye* LV 49.19; 78.16; *mediniye* 341.9.—(*i*-stems) *bodhiyaṣṭiye* Mv ii.131.13 (prose); *bodhiye* 362.1 (vs); *rātriye* Mv i.228.15 (prose; repeating a passage of line 11 where *rātrīye*; perhaps loc.); (ī-stems) *kaṭṭīyantiye* Mv i.217.7 (mss.; prose; follows and agrees with *devīye*); *janentiye* 218.14 (vs, but meter indifferent); *prakṛtiye* 233.14 (prose; 'mentioned', stem *prakṛtī*, fem. to °*ta*); *śiriye* (v.l. °*īye*) ii.90.5 (prose); *niṣkramantiye* 101.13 (prose); *istriye* (may be instr.) iii.26.21 (prose); and in verses where short *i* is required by meter, *jinajanetriye* i.219.13 = ii.21.15 (also i.218.13 where mss. °*īye*, unmetr.); *mānuṣiye prajāye* i.295.2 (Senart em. wrongly); *purimabhavajanetriye* ii.206.15 (so read, mss. °*trīye*; followed by *bhavanighātī*).

10.100. -iye, Loc.: (ī-stem) *keci sthitā dhāraṇiye varāyām* SP 330.3 (KN *dharāyāṃ*, but WT *var*°, and so Burnouf must have read, 'la meilleure').—(*i*-stem) *kukṣiye* LV 75.6 (*kukṣi* masc. and fem. in Pali, only fem. in AMg.; fem. in Skt. Lex.); (*i* or ī-stem) *vīthiye* 240.20.—(*i*-stems) *bhūmiye* Mv i.7.14; ii.435.15 (both prose; v.l. in both °*īye*); *ṛddhiye* i.44.9 (prose; so most mss., Senart °*īye* with one poor ms.); *-yaṣṭiye* (v.l. °*īye*) ii.268.2 (prose); *kṣāntiye* 340.18; 368.2; 371.8 (vss); *rātriye* iii.9.15; 296.19; 297.1 (all prose); *bhūmiye* 121.13; 451.11 (vss); (ī-stems) *śayantiye* Mv ii.11.20 (vs; inferred to be loc. from ii.9.1 ff.; or gen.?); *kumbhadāsiye* (so read, Dict.) 58.3 (vs); *vāravāliye* (v.l. °*īye*) 94.11 (prose); *pūrṇamāsiye* 306.19 (vs); 409.4 (vs; Senart em. °*sye*, wrongly).—(ī-stem) *rājadhāniye* Suv 147.1 (end of pāda; v.l. °*iya*; both metrically possible).

10.101. -iyi, Loc.: only in verses, m.c. for *-iye* (*-īye*); so to be interpreted, more likely than by transfer from the (alternative) loc. ending of Skt. monosyllabic ī-stems (*śriyi*). *rātriyi* LV 194.8 'in the night'; so Lefm. with best ms., all other mss. *rātriya*; *bodhiyi* Bhad 19 (or gen.). Both *i*-stems.

10.102. Obl. sg. -īya, -īyā, -iyā, -iya. These endings are much less common in Mv than *-iye* etc., but interchangeable with the latter, and at times juxtaposed in the same passage. Thus Mv ii.98.12 (prose) *sudhanasya kumārasya kiṃnarīya* (so mss., Senart em. °*īye*, unnecessarily) *udāraṃ premaṃ nipatitaṃ, kiṃnarīye pi sudhanasya premaṃ nipatitaṃ*. Or Mv iii.116.15–16 *mahāprajāpatīye gautamīye*, while shortly before, 116.7–8, we find *mahāprajāpatīya gautamīya*. Other texts than Mv show these endings (like *-īye* etc.) almost exclusively in verses; but cf. *mahārājñīya* Mmk 24.18 (prose). The verses of SP, however, where *-iye* and its congeners are extremely rare, show *-īya* and its congeners much more frequently. In the verses of most texts, I believe, the two types are about equally common. The forms with short *i* are pretty rare, and even in Mv are hard to find in prose (but *jātabhūmiya* Mv iii.93.2, prose).

10.103. -īya, Instr.: (*i*-stems) *smṛtīya* SP 158.10; *dyutīya* 175.4; *ṛddhīya* 309.15; *prakṛtīya* 371.8 (cf. 359.13 *prakṛtya*, m.c. for °*tyā*). — (*i*-stem) *āratīya* (Lefm. em., m.c.; mss. *aratiya*) *ratīya saṃvase na ca sārdhaṃ* LV 325.11 (wrongly divided in ed.; 'and I do not dwell together with displeasure or pleasure', so Tib.); (ī-stems) LV *devīya* 28.18; *śirīya* 241.6.—(*i*-stems) *pratipattīya* Mv ii.357.20 (vs); *tṛptīya* 370.3 (vs); *buddhīya* (v.l. °*iya*) 434.14 (prose); (ī-stems) Mv *kiṃnarīya* (so mss., Senart °*ye*) ii.96.9 (prose); *agramahiṣīya* 422.2 (prose); *mahādevīya* 457.6; *devīya* 450.7; *śirīya* iii.407.8 (prose; v.l. °*yo*; Senart em. °*yā*!). — *bhadracarīya* (*i*-stem) Bhad 41. — *vicaratīya* (ī-stem; pres. pple. fem.) Gv 301.17 (vs).

10.104. -īya, Abl.: (*i*-stem) *bhittīya* (no v.l.; in same line *bhittiye*) Mv i.6.8 (prose); (ī-stem) *śirīya* ii.62.18 (abl. of comparison).

10.105. -īya, Gen.: (*i*-stems) *kṣāntīya* SP 273.10; *ahaṃ ca bodhīya* (WT *bodhāya* with ms. K') *vadāmi varṇān* SP 55.6, 'I declare the aspects (or, speak the praises) of enlightenment'; *rātrīya yāmasmi ha madhyamasmin* 25.14 'in the mid watch of the night' (wrongly Burnouf and Kern); *pañcāśatīya* 304.2 (or instr.?); (ī-stems) *pṛthivīya* SP 53.10; 363.6; *jātīya* 362.4.—(*i*-stem) *kṣāntīya* LV 183.1. —(*i*-stem) *bodhīya mūle* Mv i.3.1 (prose) 'at the foot of the Bo-tree'; (ī-stems) Mv *devīya* i.204.16 and 207.16 (vss); i.223.10 (here Senart em. °*īye*); ii.66.8, 10 (in 10 v.l. °*īye*); 441.3; iii.7.4; 25.11 (all prose); *strīya* (so mss.; see Dict. s.v. *varṇadhātu*) ii.60.3 (vs); *mahāprajāpatīya . . . gautamīya* iii.116.7–8 (prose); *cetīya* 128.3 (prose).—(*i*-stem) *carīya* Bhad 24.—(ī-stem) *mahārājñīya* Mmk 24.18 (prose).

10.106. -īya, Loc.: (*i*-stems) *adhimuktīya* SP 31.6 (so ed. with Kashgar rec.; Nep. mss. °*muktau hi*, lect. fac.); *nirvṛtīya* 33.2 (so ed. with Kashgar rec.; Nep. mss. *nirvṛtau hi*, lect. fac.).—(*i*-stem) *bhūmīya* LV 178.14 (v.l. °*īye*, metrically poor).—(*i*-stem) *rātrīya* Mv iii.365.13 (vs); (ī-stems) *pañcadaśīya* Mv i.164.20 (vs), 'on the 15th day'; *vārāṇasīya* (mss., Senart em. °*īye*) ii.188.21 (prose); *karkarīya* (in 2 v.l. °*iya*) 249.2, 5 (prose); *pṛthivīya* 414.20 (vs); *devīya* 427.17 (prose); *padminīya* 448.17 (here mss. *padmanīya*, Senart em. *padminīye*), 19; 450.11 (Senart em. °*nīye*), all prose; *vāpīya* 451.1 (prose; Senart em. °*īye*). — *dharaṇīya* Suv 235.8 (ī-stem). — *bhadracarīya* Bhad 44 (*i*-stem).

10.107. -īyā, Instr.: *dyutīyā* (m.c.) SP 164.12 (*i*-stem); *caturaṅginīyā senayāye* (on this see § 9.70) Mv i.158.13 (prose; ī-stem).

10.108. -iyā, Instr.: (*i*-stem) *prītiyā* Mv iii.374.16 (vs); (ī-stem) *śirijātimantiyā* ii.57.8, 12 (end of pāda).—(*i*-stem) *pratipattiyā* RP 11.1 (vs).—(*i*-stem) *buddhiyā* Gv 240.23 (vs).—(*i*-stems) *matiyā*, *gatiyā* Sukh 22.16 (vs).

10.109. -iyā, Abl.: (*i*-stem) *dūre vayam uttama-m-agrabodhiyā* SP 203.9, 'we are far from supreme enlightenment'. So ed. with Kashgar rec.; Nep. mss. °*bodhaye*, the Skt. dative, which is not easy to construe.

10.110. -iyā, Loc.: (*i*-stems) *upapattiyā* Mv i.282.18 (vs, meter indifferent); *subhūmiyā* ii.423.12 (vs, *i* m.c.).

10.111. -iya, Instr.: gender doubtful: *añjaliya* (v.l. °*īya*; meter troublesome, *i* prob. right) Mv ii.299.17 (vs). —Other (fem.) *i*-stem: *kṣāntiya* (so mss., Senart em. *kṣāntyā*) Mv iii.441.1 (vs). (For *śiriya*, m.c. for *śriyā*, see below, § 10.125.)

10.112. -iya, Gen.: (*i*-stems) *jātabhūmiya* (no v.l.) Mv iii.93.2 (prose). — *buddhiya* (m.c.) Dbh.g. 3(339).7 (vs).—Gender doubtful: *samādhiya* (m.c.) Samādh 19.27 (vs).

10.113. Obl. sg. -īyo and its variants -īyu (m.c.), -iyo. Rare, but there is too much evidence to be ignored. Neither Pali nor Pkt. seems to know such endings. It may be that the Skt. ending *-iyas*, abl.-gen. sg. of monosyllabic ī-stems, is at the bottom of *-iyo*, while *-īyo* (*-īyu*) could be a blend of this with *-īye*, *-īya* etc. Furthermore,

-īyo is much used as nom.-acc. pl. ending of (mostly fem.) *i* and *ī*-stems in our dialect (as are *-īo* in Pkt. and *-iyo* in Pali). The identity in Skt. of the ending (*-iyas*) of the nom.-acc. pl. and the abl.-gen. sg. of monosyllabic *ī*-stems may have helped in the extension of *-īyo* first to the abl.-gen. sg., then to the other oblique cases. The formula would be *śriyo* (nom.-acc. pl.): *śriyo* (abl.-gen. sg.) = *śrīyo* (etc.): x. This x is *śrīyo*, etc., abl.-gen. sg. Cf. also the ending *-yas* etc., § 10.138.

10.114. -īyo, Instr.: Masc., or gender doubtful: *añjalīyo* Mv ii.395.15, 19 (vss); so mss.; Senart em. °*īye*; parallel Śikṣ 308.6, 8, reading *añjalībhir*.

10.115. -īyo, Abl.: *nābhīyo* Mv ii.152.13, 16 (prose; *i*-stem; Senart °*ye*, but both mss. °*yo* in 13, and one ms. in 16).

10.116. -īyo, Gen.: (*ī*-stems) *nārīyo* Mv ii.3.7 (vs; repetition of i.199.9 where *nārīye*); *kumbhadāsīyo* iii.264.10 (prose; so read for mss. °*vāsīyo*, v.l. °*vāsiyo*, ed. em. °*vāsīye*).

10.117. -īyo, Loc.: (*ī*-stem) *padminīyo udaka*°, or *padminīyo daka*° Mv ii.450.17 (prose), mss.; Senart em. °*nīye udaka*°.

10.118. -īyu, only in verse, m.c. for *īyo*; Gen. (*i*-stem) *gatīyu* Gv 253.13.

10.119. -iyo, Gen. In verse, but in the only occurrence noted the meter is indifferent as to quantity of *i*. (*ī*-stem) *deviyo* Mv i.183.19 (vs; so all mss. except one °*īyo*; Senart em. *deviye*).

10.120. Obl. sg. -yā, -ya. The ending *-yā* is the regular Skt. ending of the instr. sg. of *i*- and polysyllabic *ī*-stems. Except for lack of final visarga (or *s*), it is also an ending of the abl.-gen., and except for lack of final nasal (anusvāra), of the loc. Such endings are not common in our texts, and might be supposed to be due to corrupt tradition. But, especially since we also find (in verses, and doubtless only m.c.) the ending *-ya*, with shortened *a*, it is probable that genuine forms, rather than corruptions, are concerned. Prose occurrences are marked as such.

10.121. -yā, Instr.: The regular Skt. ending of feminines. A probable case of its transfer to a masculine: *vināpi cāgnyā paramaṃ subhairavam* SP 86.13 (vs), so all Nep. mss.; KN with Kashgar rec. *cāgneḥ* (probably lect. fac.), kept by WT.

10.122. -yā, Abl.: *anyatra devyātiguṇānvitāyā* LV 29.10, 'except the queen . . .'; in Skt. *anyatra* governs only the abl.; here saṃdhi makes the quantity of the final indeterminate; *jātyā parimokṣante* 104.16 (prose) 'are (will be) freed from birth'; no v.l.; the following parallel sentence has ablative. Similarly *jātyā* (all mss.; here Calc. *jātyāḥ*) *parimocayiṣyati* 226.19 (prose).

10.123. -yā, Gen.: *tīre hi nadyā sthitaḥ* LV 271.18; *devyā* (before *p*-; no v.l.) Mv i.177.14 (prose).

10.124. -yā, Loc.: *daśabhūmyāhaṃ* Suv 30.1 and 32.5, certainly to be read, m.c. for °*myām aham*. The best ms. has °*myāhaṃ* in 32.5, °*mya ahaṃ* in 30.1. Nobel seems to me to misunderstand line 30.1, which is to be read *sthāsyāmi daśabhūmyāhaṃ daśaratnākare vare*; the forms in *-e* are loc. sg. (not acc. pl. with Nobel), in apposition with *daśabhūmyā(m)*. The Chin. translations cited by Nobel himself confirm this.

10.125. -ya, Instr.: *prakṛtya saṃtiṣṭhati śrotram etat* SP 359.13, 'this hearing-faculty exists by nature'; one ms. *prakṛti* (unmetrical); cf. *prakṛtīya* in similar phrase 371.8; *dṛṣṭya* Gv 485.24.—The form *śiriya*, m.c. for *śriyā*, LV 241.10, Mv iii.115.8, may be included here, tho it might also be classed with forms in *-iya*, § 10.111. I assume that it is based directly on the Skt. form, with epenthetic *i* in the first syllable.

10.126. -ya, Gen.: *bhūmya* Dbh.g. 19(355).23 (before vowel, see § 10.138) and 20(356).21 (before consonant); *girinadya samaṃ* LV 173.14 (or instr.? Lefm. prints as one cpd. word).

10.127. -ya, Loc.: *-nadya* Suv 35.11; in Mv i.72.8 (vs) mss. *kāśipūryāṃ*; Senart °*puryāṃ*; but meter requires a short final syllable; °*purya* would be an acceptable emendation (the Skt. ending was put in by a later copyist).

10.128. Miscellaneous fem. sg. oblique endings. Finally, certain endings are peculiar to particular fem. sg. oblique cases, tho not found in Skt. Very rarely they seem to be used with masculines, by transfer. They are here classified under the several cases.

10.129. Instrumental -īyeṇa (cf. Abl. *-yātas*). The fem. ending *-īye* with the masc.-nt. *-na* added: *balena ca ṛddhīyena ca jñānena ca* Mv ii.76.14 (prose). Note the surrounding forms in *-na*, which are evidently concerned in the blend formation.

10.130. Dat. -ye for -yai: *bodhi-saṃbhāra-pūrye* Dbh.g. 52(78).11; confirmed by *-pūryai* 55(81).13. Perhaps mere corruption of tradition, and to be emended.

10.131. Dat. -īyai, for -īye: equivalent to Skt. *-yai*; a blend of these two, apparently. *yoginīyai bhīṣmabhaginīyai* (!) Sādh 404.8 (prose); *vikīrṇakeśīyai . . .* °*dhāriṇīyai* 9.

10.132. Abl. -īto, -ītas, etc. Usually *-īto* without regard to saṃdhi; chiefly in Mv (prose as well as verse), and not limited to Skt. *ī*-stems; thus from *bhūmi* (Vedic *bhūmī*), *bhūmīto* Mv i.136.4 (prose), and iii.376.7 (prose); to be sure v.l. *bhūmito* both times. Other stems: *pṛthivīto* Mv i.217.10 (prose); *vaiśālīto* 259.7, 12 (prose); *vārāṇasīto* 287.13; 311.1; 313.11 etc. (all prose); *aṅgulīto* ii.73.1; iii.358.9 (here v.l. °*ito*; both prose); *nadīto* (v.l. °*ito*) ii.244.8; *mṛgīto* iii.151.11 (prose). — *tasmān* (!) *nagarīto* Divy 222.6–7. — *nadīto* Jm 240.7 (App.; prose; parallel to Mv ii.244.8). — *śrāvastīto* Av i.326.5 (prose; v.l. °*tā*). — *-hāriṇītaḥ* Māy 237.20 ff. (prose); long series of cpds. having this final.

10.133. Abl. -ito, -itaḥ, etc. Generally *-ito* without regard to saṃdhi. Chiefly in verses except for Mv. Not limited to *i*-stems; from *ī*-stem, *vaiśālito* Mv i.255.2; ii.207.15 (both prose, no v.l.). These circumstances seem to me to justify us in regarding *-ito* as essentially Prakritic, despite the rather extensive occurrence in Skt. of *-tas* ablatives from all sorts of nouns (Whitney 1098b). It seems to belong naturally with *-īto*, which I have noted only from fem. nouns; *-ito*, however, occurs also from nouns that are usually masculine, and perhaps might better be placed above; see § 10.71. Other cases: *bhūmito* LV 75.1 (vs); Mv i.91.2; 127.14 (both prose); *aṅgulito* (v.l. °*īto*) Mv iii.358.4 (prose); *tasmād* (!) *ṛddhitaḥ* Divy 223.28 (prose).—Masculine, or doubtful in gender: *samādhito* SP 25.3 (vs); Mv ii.209.2; 241.2 (both prose); *vyādhito* Mv i.308.8 (prose); Suv 38.11 (vs).

10.134. Abl. -ītu, m.c. for *-īto*: *-taṭītu* Gv 213.16 (vs).

10.135. Abl. -itu, m.c. for *-ito*: *pratipattitu* Śikṣ 4.16, 17 (vss).

10.136. Abl. -yātas: nonce blend of *-yā* (for *-yās*) and *-tas*; cf. Instr. *-īyena*, § 10.129. *tasmād* (!) *devanagaryātas* Divy 223.7 (prose); cf. *tasmān nagarīto* and *tasmād ṛddhitaḥ*, above.

10.137. Abl. -ihi: as in Ap. (Alsdorf, Kum. § 24 for fem. stems; as gen. for masc. and fem. stems ibid. §§ 23, 24, and Jacobi Bhav. § 28, San. § 17). *durgatihi durgatiṃ gacchanti* Mv i.27.9 (prose), 'they go from one evil fate to another'. That an abl. sing. (not pl.) is meant is proved by the sense and by adjoining parallels in *-āto* from *a*-stems.

10.138. Gen. -yas, -yo, instead of *-yās* (cf. also *-yā*, *-ya* above), occurs in both *i* and *ī* stems; but the only unambiguous cases are in Gv (by misprint? this text is full of misprints). If genuine, however, the form could be explained as analogical to the ending *-yas* of the nom. pl. (*devyas*). Even in Skt. monosyllabic *ī*-stems

have the same ending in the nom. pl. and abl.-gen. sg., and in our dialect this condition is more widespread; cf. above, § 10.113. All in prose: *-gatyo* (to *gati*) Gv 106.20; *vāsantyo* (to °*tī*) 223.16; 224.15, 17; *praśāntarutasāgaravatyo* (to °*vatī*) 286.23, 25; *śrīmatyaś ca* (to *śrīmatī* or °*ti*) 466.11, 13, but 2d ed. °*tyāś* (by em.?). The only other possible case is *bhūmya ākārān* Dbh.g. 19(355).23 (vs) where *bhūmya* might stand for °*yaḥ* in saṃdhi, but probably intends the ending *-ya*, § 10.126, hiatus being freely allowed in verses; note that *bhūmya* occurs before a consonant on the next page, 20(356).21.

10.139. Gen. -aye. A reflex of the later Skt. and general MIndic use of gen. forms in dat. function is the occasional appearance of the reverse, the use of Skt. datives (or MIndic derivatives thereof) in gen. function: *nāsti smṛtaye hāniḥ* Mv i.160.12 (prose), 'there is no loss of memory' (one of the 18 *āveṇika buddhadharma*). All mss. *smṛtaye*; there is no doubt of the gen. function nor of the stem *smṛti*. Senart emends to *smṛtiye*. But the following forms in *-ayi* confirm *smṛtaye*.

10.140. Gen. -ayi, only in verse, m.c. for the preceding. *agrabodhayi kāraṇāt* Śikṣ 100.17 (vs, cited from Samādh), 'for the sake of supreme enlightenment'. — *bodhayi citta* KP 28.8 (vs), 'thought of enlightenment'.

10.141. Gen. -īyaṃ. A MIndic form of the locative ending (§ 10.144), but according to the mss. at Mv ii.444.11–12 it is also used by analogical extension in *genitive* function (*-īya, -īye* etc. being used for *any* oblique case including loc.; hence the loc. form is also used for another oblique case). The phrase is *tasyā* . . . *rājadhītuḥ* . . . *krīḍayantīyaṃ ramantīyaṃ pravicārayantīyaṃ etad abhūṣi*. Senart emends all three to °*īye*. Cf. the ending *-āyāṃ* as Abl.-gen. of *ā*-stems, § 9.52.

10.142. Loc. -āyāṃ (also *-āya* or *-āyā*; *-āye, -aye*). The ending of *ā*-stems, taken over into *i*-stems sporadically by influence of an immediately preceding and coordinate *ā*-stem loc.: *anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau* SP 328.2, 3, 5, 7, 8 (prose) in both edd.; but the Kashgar rec. (Thomas ap. Hoernle, MR 134 f.) reads °*saṃbodhāyāṃ*, carrying over the ending of *anuttarāyāṃ*. A very similar case, tending to confirm the reading *-āyāṃ*, occurs in: *anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbuddhāya*, or °*āyā* Mv i.40.6; one of the latter must be read. Senart emends to *anuttarāye*, and keeps °*saṃbuddhāya*, but wrongly takes it as a form (presumably dat.) of a neuter stem *saṃbuddha*, said to = *saṃbodhi*. There is no such stem; the SP passages cited in Senart's note p. 404 contain *-buddhatvaṃ*, not *-buddhaṃ*. We must certainly read a loc. fem. from either *saṃbodhi* or *saṃbuddhi*; the latter would be closer to the mss., and *saṃbuddhi* exists in Pali. The seemingly dat. form (*samyaksaṃ*)*bodhaye*, on which see Dict. s.v. *vyākaroti*, may really represent *-āye* and be meant for the loc. which is normal with that verb.

10.143. Loc. -īyāṃ. Has been noted only once, in Mv i.147.6 (prose) *jātīyāṃ*; the next line reads *jātau*. Should we read *jātīyaṃ*, with the following group?

10.144. Loc. -īyaṃ (cf. § 10.141 for the same as genitive). MIndic for *-yāṃ* (cf. Pali *-iyaṃ* beside *-iyā*, the usual oblique-case ending; acc. to Pischel no *-īaṃ* or the like, loc. in final nasal, seems to occur in Pkt.). It is almost limited to Mv; in other texts I have noted only *dharaṇīyaṃ* Suv 227.7 (vs), where Nobel emends to °*ṇiyāṃ*. In Mv however it is fairly common, in prose as well as verse; the following examples are all from prose, except as marked (vs): (*i*-stems) *lipīyaṃ* Mv iii.184.6 (same, with v.l. °*iyaṃ*, ii.423.15); *yonīyaṃ* ii.350.14 = iii.274.16 (vs); *bhūmīyaṃ* ii.435.15 (same, with v.l. °*iyaṃ*, iii.357.9); *rātrīyaṃ* iii.197.15; (*ī*-stems) *śrāvastīyaṃ* i.4.12; *dīpavatīyaṃ* . . . *rājadhānīyaṃ* 195.7; 196.15; *vaiśālīyaṃ* 290.6; *vārāṇasīyaṃ* 303.5; 326.3; ii.66.8; iii.145.19 etc.; *pṛthivīyaṃ* i.347.11; ii.208.12; 282.9, 13; iii.410.2, 3 etc.; *ujjenīyaṃ* ii.30.7; *puṣkariṇīyaṃ* ii.95.16; 172.10; *caturdaśīyaṃ* 273.10; *dhāraṇīyaṃ* 434.11; *vīthīyaṃ* iii.35.17; *strīyaṃ* 291.4; *saṅkhamedhīyaṃ* 328.14; *dvādaśīyaṃ* 340.16; *saṃjayantīyaṃ* 364.4.

10.145. Loc. -iyaṃ, = prec. Only in Mv, but in prose as well as verse; not common. *praveṇiyaṃ* (*i* or *ī*-stem) Mv i.226.10 (vs), repeated ii.29.13 where mss. °*ya*, Senart em. °*ye*; but cf. ii.32.3 (prose) and 38.11 (vs) where mss. *praveśiyaṃ*, Senart em. *praveṇiyaṃ*, rightly; *vaiśāliyaṃ* (*ī*-stem) ii.207.14 (prose); (*i*-stems) *durgatiyaṃ* (? reading and interpretation doubtful) ii.225.13 (vs); *lipiyaṃ* ii.434.11 (prose); *bhūmiyaṃ* iii.114.16, 18 (in 18 v.l. °*īyaṃ*); 357.10 (all prose); *subhūmiyaṃ* 184.4 (v.l. °*īyaṃ*) = 405.10 (vs, meter doubtful).

Dual nom.-acc. masc. *-inau*

10.146. From a masc. *i*-stem; the ending of *in*-stems taken over. *yūthapatinau* Mv i.360.17 (prose).

Dual instr. *-ibhya*, m.c. for *-ibhyāṃ*

10.147. *pāṇibhya gṛhya* LV 153.13 (vs). There is a v.l. *pāṇibhyāṃ*, unmetrical.

Nominative-accusative plural

10.148. In our dialect a complete blend has taken place between all endings of the nom. and acc. pl. of all *i* and *ī* declensions, in all three genders. That is, any ending which may be used in the nom. or acc. pl. of any *i*, *ī*, or *in* stem, of any gender, is likely at any moment to occur in such a form, either acc. or nom., of any other such stem. It is true that there are differences of frequency in such occurrences. Thus the Prakritic ending *-īyo* is much commoner with fem. stems, tho it unquestionably occurs with masculines too. It is, of course, always true that in all our texts, as presented in the editions and presumably in the mss., regular Skt. forms are common; in most texts, certainly, much commoner than the dialectic forms which are the exclusive topic of this work. This does not importantly affect the main point, which is that all the endings of all *i*, *ī* and *in*-declensions in these two cases are fundamentally interchangeable. It is safe to assume that a large proportion of the regular Skt. forms are the result of secondary regularization in the course of tradition.

10.149. In this respect our language seems to go somewhat farther than any MIndic dialect as described in standard grammars. For Pali, Geiger (82–86) does indeed abandon any attempt to separate nom. from acc. forms in any *i* or *ī* stem; he gives *aggayo* and *aggī* for both cases alike, and so also *jātiyo* and *jātī*. Pischel's 387 goes equally far for the fems., but his masc. paradigm 377 is less explicit; yet 381 recognizes 'dialektisch fast alle Formen des N. auch im Acc.'. Some interchange between endings originally peculiar to particular types is, of course, recognized in both Pischel and Geiger. Indeed this process, as well as confusion of nom. with acc. pl., has got a good start even in normal Skt., and still more in Epic Skt..

10.150. I suspect that future work in MIndic may reveal more mixture of these forms than Geiger and Pischel suggest; that is, a closer approach to the state of things in our dialect. In any case, it seems to me that realism demands that we make endings, rather than Skt. declensional type or gender or case, the primary basis of our classification of all nom.-acc. pl. forms.

10.151. Without attempting any rigid scheme (which would only confuse our statement), we shall in general begin with endings which exist in standard Skt. as either nom. or acc. of some *i*, *ī*, or *in*-declensional type, showing how they are here extended to other types or to the

other case. We shall then follow with endings which do not exist at all in Skt. in these cases. But this order will be violated whenever convenient grouping of forms demands it.

10.152. Nom.-acc. pl. -ayas. The regular Skt. ending of the nom. pl. in short *i*-stems. Twice, at least, it is used as nom. pl. of a masc. *in*-stem, viz.: *dvīpayo* (for *dvīpino*) *hanyanti* Mv ii.213.7; 217.12 (both prose).

10.153. It is also frequently used as acc. pl., as sometimes in Epic Skt. (Edgerton, Bulletin Deccan College Research Institute, 5, 1943–4, 2, *rāśayaḥ* Mbh. 2.48.9d, Crit. ed.) as well as in MIndic. My examples concern m. and f. short *i*-stems only; probably by oversight I have failed to record cases of *ī*-stems (some stems, like *rātri*, are perhaps ambiguous). Prose examples (all marked as such) occur in Mv and once each in SP and KP. The SP occurrence is noteworthy, since MIndic forms have mostly been eliminated from the prose of that text, especially as presented in the Nep. mss.

Masculine *i*-stems, acc. pl.: *-rāśayo* SP 50.10; *dundubhayaś* (or fem.; no v.l.) 69.11 (prose); *trayo* 198.3. — *apāya trayo* (so divide) LV 300.21; *sarvāṃ* (so read with best mss.) *sattva kareya ekamatayaḥ* 335.19 'one might make all beings of one mind'. — *rāśayo* Mv i.107.16 (prose); *lecchavayo* 262.2 (prose); *ṛṣayo* ii.217.15 (prose); iii.45.4 (vs); 364.4, 6 (both prose); *jñātayo* iii.86.8; 292.7. — *-vanaspatayo* KP 30.1 (prose). — *samādhayaḥ* Laṅk 24.16.

Feminine *i*-stems, acc. pl.: *rātrayo* SP 91.3 (at end of a jagatī pāda; *rātrīr*, making a triṣṭubh, would be just as satisfactory metrically); *niruktayaś* 374.2. — *kāmaratayaḥ* LV 192.5; 327.10, 19. — *bhūmayo* Mv i.102.11.

10.154. Nom.-acc. pl. -aya, only in verse, m.c. for the preceding: *vyādhaya bhonti* SP 96.15 (nom. pl.; WT °*ayu* with ms. K′).

10.155. Nom.-acc. pl. -inas (-ino etc.). The nom.-acc. pl. ending of *in*-stems in Skt. is used also with *i*-stems, chiefly masc., but once or twice even fem. In most texts rare and only in verses; in Mv also in prose.

Masc. nom.: *durbuddhinaś ca* SP 272.1. — *asino* (mss. *asito*, em. Senart) Mv i.17.6 (prose); *samabuddhino* 134.13 (prose); *nirmāṇaratino* 240.4; ii.16.4; *-patino* i.216.16 = ii.19.13 (vs); i.361.7 (prose); *-buddhino* iii.457.2.

Fem. nom.: *varamālyavastradhāriṇo pramadā* Mv i.149.2.

Fem. acc.: (*vetti* . . .) *lipino 'kṣaradṛśyarūpāṃ* LV 125.12. The stem *lipi* is fem. even in LV; cf. shortly after, 125.18–19, *katamāṃ* . . . *lipiṃ*.

10.156. Nom.-acc. pl. -inā. Instead of *-ino*, the mss. of Mv read *-inā* at least twice, as nom. pl. masc. of an *i*-stem. Senart emends to *-ino* both times. The form may however be real; it would merely imply an *a*-extension of an *in*-stem (§ 10.3) and then transfer to *i*-stems. *asinā* (mss.) Mv i.10.13 (vs); *lokapatinā* (mss.) i.204.12 (vs). To be sure, the latter passage is repeated with °*patino* ii.8.7.

10.157. Nom.-acc. pl. -ina, only in verses, m.c. for *-inas*. The following are nom. pl. of *in*-stems: *prāṇina* SP 89.12; *-cāriṇa* RP 17.9.

10.158. Nom.-acc. pl. -īno. Once at least in the mss. of Mv for *-ino*, nom. pl. of a stem in *-(v)in*: *medhāvīno* (mss.) Mv i.274.3 (prose). Senart em. *medhāvino*; but cf. next.

10.159. Nom.-acc. pl. -īna: like the preceding, for *-inas*, once in the mss. of Mv as nom. pl. from a stem in *-(v)in*: *-caritāvīna* (mss.; before *b-*) Mv ii.218.14 (prose). Senart em. °*vino*; but cf. prec. and next.

And once as acc. pl. of a (masc. or fem. adj.) *i*-stem, in a verse, where it may well be m.c. for *-inas*: *upalambhadṛṣṭīna* SP 383.12 (certainly acc. pl., with *bhikṣu* or *bhikṣuṇī*).

10.160. Nom.-acc. pl. -īni: the regular nt. ending, is used with indubitably masc. and fem. nouns, *i* and *ī* stems. Sometimes one might speak of 'change of gender', but this can hardly be accepted as describing neuter forms from stems like *ṛṣi* and *ceṭī*. The following examples seem inexplicable except on the supposition that formal gender-distinctions were breaking down (see §§ 6.1 ff. and especially 6.4). *tṛṇakuṭīparṇakuṭīni kṛtvā* Mv i.284.1 (prose), 'making grass-huts and leaf-huts'. One ms. °*kuṭṭiparṇakuṭṭini*. In Mv i.338.5 *ṣaṇṇavati* (mss. °*tiṃ*) *pratyekabuddhakoṭīni* (nom.) *nirvṛtāni svayaṃbhuno*. In ii.211.16 (prose) mss. *tṛṇakuṭṭi-* (v.l. °*kuṭi-*) *parṇakuṭṭini* (Senart em. °*kuṭīni*; acc.) *saṃsthāpeti*. — *ceṭīni* (acc.) *pṛcchati* ii.172.15 (prose; masc. or nt. pronouns *teṣāṃ*, *te*, are used of these same maidservants in lines 10, 11 of the same page); *etāni vanaspatīni* 178.7–8 and 9 (prose) 'these trees', and *etāni ca puṣkariṇīni* (prose; mss. °*īna*, cf. preceding paragraph! but here *etāni* and *nirodakāni* make Senart's em. attractive) *nirodakāni* id. 10 (all these nom.); *ṛṣīṇi bhojeti* iii.42.14 (prose) 'feeds the ṛṣis'; *-kuṭīni* Mv iii.168.14 (nom.; so Senart, mss. *-kuṭī* or *kuṭṭinī*); *dhānyajātīni* 178.3 (nom.); others (acc.) in Dschi, NAWGött. 1949, 276 ff.; *trīṇi* with m. and f. nouns, §§ 6.14, 16.

10.161. Nom.-acc. pl. -īnī, with lengthening of the final vowel of *-īni* m.c.: *trīṇī ca yānāny* . . . SP 33.4 (vs). Kashgar rec. *trayaś*.

10.162. Nom.-acc. pl. -yas, the nom. pl. ending of polysyllabic fem. *ī*-stems, is used at least once in a masc. *i*-stem (as nom.): *-vanaspatyo* SP 126.10 (vs). One ms. has °*patayo*, which is metrically less attractive (end of odd pāda of anuṣṭubh).

It is also used, much more commonly, as acc.; the following concern fem. *ī*-stems. Frequent is *koṭyaḥ* (°*yo*, etc.) as acc. of *koṭī* (which seems to be regularly an *ī*-stem in our language, so far as it can be said to recognize such distinctions at all): SP 30.15; 63.9; 335.8; LV 223.17 (but most mss. °*yāḥ*); 299.2; Mv i.174.14; Samādh 8.16 (prose) etc., 22.23 (vs); Suv 23.16.—Others: *bhikṣuṇyo varjayen* SP 279.5 (so read with Kashgar rec. and WT; KN with Nep. *bhikṣuṇīṃ*); *kumāryaś ca vivarjayet* SP 279.12; *krandantyo 'paśyat* LV 301.22 (prose).

10.163. Nom.-acc. pl. -ya, in verses, m.c. for the preceding. *nadya* LV 197.5; *bhūmya* Dbh.g. 38(64).13 (acc., not loc.; read *te bhūmya sapta suviśodhita-*).

10.164. Nom.-acc. pl. -yā(s), perhaps a blend of *-yas* with the nom.(-acc.) ending *-ās* of *a* (and *ā*) stems; or analogical to the abl.-gen. sg. ending *-yā(s)*, the reverse of the process suggested in § 10.138. Cf. the endings *-iyā*, *-īyā*, §§ 10.170, 174. Instead of *koṭyas* (above) we find repeatedly *koṭyās* (or °*yā* before voiced sounds). The following are acc. pl. *koṭyā(s)*, all in verses: SP 13.10; LV 113.17; 299.11 (and most mss. in 223.17 *koṭyāḥ*, Lefm. with ms. A *koṭyaḥ*).

In LV 78.18 (vs), for *hayagajarathapaṅktyā* (*vāhanā*), two mss. (including the best, A) are said to read °*paktyā*; this must surely have intended °*pattyā(s)*, acc. pl. to (masc.) *patti*, 'footsoldiers', the fourth division of the army (the other three precede it); doubtless read so. In the sequel all four divisions are referred to in more detail, the footsoldiers in 79.7–9, which confirms my interpretation. Cf. also LV 80.13. Tib. seems to have had a quite different text (I cannot find a basis for Foucaux's transl.).

More dubious is *kṣāntyās te jagi vividha duruktāḥ* LV 164.5. Foucaux 'Tu as . . . supporté avec patience bien des paroles dures', which seems to imply *kṣāntās*. Foucaux renders the Tib. 'supporte avec patience de nombreuses paroles mauvaises', which suggests interpretation of *kṣāntyās* as a gerundive (as if *kṣāmyās*); Tib. text khyod ni . . . bzod, which if I am not mistaken may mean 'you have endured'. The form is doubtful, and in any case

hardly belongs here; a rendering 'thy various (instances of) patient endurance(s) in the world are hard to declare', as if nom. pl. of *kṣānti*, would ignore the standard meaning of *durukta* and Pali *durutta* (see Childers s.v.).

nidrākṣyā, n. pl. f., 'sleepy-eyed', Mv ii.203.1 (vs; mss., see Dict. s.v. *nidrākṣa*).

10.165. Nom.-acc. pl. -īn, -īṃ. The Skt. acc. pl. ending of masc. *i*-stems may be written *-īṃ*, in our dialect an orthographic variant for *-īn*. It seems to occur at least once as nom. pl. masc.: *hayagajarathapattīṃ sainya śrīmadvicitrāṃ, dvāri sthita nṛpasyā śrūyate uccaghoṣāḥ* LV 80.13 (vs). Several mss. °*pattī* or °*patti*, but all *vicitrāṃ*; both edd. as text. No possible construction as acc.; the forms must intend nom. pl. with *sthita*.

It is also used as acc. pl. fem., once even written *-īn* (for *jātīṃ* [?] see § 10.166): *tebhyaś ca vaiḍūryamaṇihārajālebhyo dīrghapaṅktīn kṣalantīn apaśyat* Gv 518.25 (prose). Here *kṣalantī-* is unmistakably fem., and we seem clearly to have the masc. ending on fem. stems. (A singular would be implausible in the context and would require *-īm*.)

Finally, *-īn* is used in the acc. pl. of *in*-stems, for Skt. *-inas* (in verses, and in prose of Mv): *adhimānīn* SP 279.3 (stem *adhimānin*); *prāṇīn* 280.3 (stem *prāṇin*). — *chandaka-kālodāyīn* (v.l. °*yīm*; followed by *ā-*) Mv ii.233.16 (prose), 'Chandaka and Kālodāyin' (acc.). — *medhavīn* Gv 25.13 (in anuṣṭubh vs, to be read *medhāvīn anantamatīn*, stem *medhāvin*; but 2d ed. *medhāvino 'nanta*°). — *vaśīṃś ca* Dbh.g. 51(77).2 (stem *vaśin*).

10.166. Acc. pl. -iṃ. Seems clearly recorded a few times in Mv. If the readings be accepted, it may be one more example of confusion between nom. and acc. endings sing. and pl.; cf. *-iḥ*, etc., as nom. pl., § 10.190, and see § 8.83. Note, however, that it might be merely a phonetic (MIndic) form of Skt. *-īn*, often written *-īṃ* in our texts; the shortening of the vowel would be normal in MIndic when the nasal is retained. *hastiṃ* Mv ii.453.14 (mss.; prose); a plural acc. seems clearly required; Senart em. *hastīṃ* (Skt. *hastinaḥ*); *ekāṃ vā jātiṃ dvau vā jatiṃ trayo vā jātiṃ catvāri vā jātiṃ* etc. Mv i.228.16 ff. (prose). In this list one ms. sometimes reads *jātiḥ*, but apparently no form with long *ī* is recorded; Senart prints *jātiṃ*, tho surely a plural must be meant. In a similar list Mv ii. 284.8 ff., Senart reads always *jātīṃ* (cf. § 10.165); but here too the mss. mostly read *jātiṃ* without v.l. (a few times v.l. *jātīṃ*). Cf. § 12.55.

10.167. Nom.(-acc.) pl. -īs; the ending of fem. *i* and polysyllabic *ī*-stems in the acc. pl., is used as nom., not only with fem. nouns (short *i*-stems as well as *ī*-stems), but even with masculine *i*-stems. Examples, all from verses:

Fem.: (*i*-stem) *bhittīś ca* SP 83.5.—(*i* or *ī*-stems) *bherīś c-* LV 194.2; *yajñakoṭīḥ* 223.18.

Masc.: *kṛtāñjalīḥ* SP 57.3. — *vanaspatīś ca* Gv 334.12.

10.168. Nom.-acc. pl. -iyas, -iyo (usually the latter, without regard to saṇdhi); Pali *-iyo*; the Skt. ending of monosyllabic (normally fem.) *ī*-stems, in both nom. and acc. pl. Here it is used with *i* and *ī* stems of all types, masc. and fem., and even with masc. *in*-stems. Cf. § 10.172.

Masc. *i*-stems, nom.: *oṣadhīvidhiyo* (? as fem., § 10.89), so probably read Mv i.115.1 (vs) (Senart *oṣadhīvidhīyo*; most mss. *oṣadhividhiyo*, unmetrical); *prāñjaliyo* 167.14 (vs; the syllable *prā* omitted in mss.), and the same 191.3 (vs); *lecchaviyo* (v.l. °*īyo*) 256.9 (prose); *-patiyo* (v.l. °*īyo*) iii.43.2 (prose).

Masc. *i*-stem, acc.: *rāśiyo* (mss. corruptly *raṃhiyo*) Mv iii.78.4 (vs).

Masc. *in*-stems, nom.: *-dvīpiyo* (stem *dvīpin*) Mv ii.62.4 (vs); *hastiyo* (stem *hastin*) 458.2 (prose).

Fem. *i*-stems, nom.: *oṣadhīyo* SP 130.11; 131.1 (vss). — *bhittiyo* (v.l. °*īyo*) Mv i.24.13 (prose); *arciyo* (§ 16.39; Pali *acci*, *accī*, fem.!) 25.14 ff. (prose); *dundubhiyo* (or masc.) ii.39.15 (vs). — *ṣaṇṇavatiyo* Gv 181.15 (prose).

Fem. *i*-stems, acc.: *oṣadhiyo* LV 151.7. — *gatiyo* Mv i.102.14 (prose); *-samāpattiyo* (v.l. °*iye*) 127.5 (prose); *bhūmiyo* (mss., Senart em. °*ayo*) 192.17 (vs); *-śreṇiyo* iii.78.3 (vs).

Fem. polysyllabic *ī*-stems, nom.: *jhallariyo* SP 52.1 (vs). — *koṭiyo* (often with v.l. °*īyo*) Mv i.59.9 and 11 (prose); 61.10, 13; 117.1; 119.4; ii.353.9, 10 (these all vss); *sravantiyo* ii.92.15 (vs); *dhātriyo* (v.l. °*īyo*) 433.11 and 13 (prose); *nāriyo* iii.8.19 (vs).

Fem. polysyllabic *ī*-stems, acc.: *koṭiyaḥ* or °*yo*, common in verses, also in Mv prose: SP 334.6; 335.4; 336.5, 8; LV 53.1; Mv i.47.3, 7; 57.8 (prose); 243.13 (prose, v.l. °*īyo*); RP 7.15; 9.1; 38.2; *-sahasriyo* Mv i.5.13; 6.4, 7, 12; 310.1 (all prose); *nāriyo* iii.451.5 (vs).

10.169. Nom.-acc. pl. -iya, noted only in verses, m.c. for the preceding.

Polysyllabic *ī*-stem, nom.: *nidarśayantiya* (= Skt. °*tyas*) LV 326.18.

Masc. *in*-stem, acc.: *dvīpiya* Mv ii.222.12 (so read with mss.; = Skt. *dvīpinas*; Senart em. *dvīpayo*; meter requires short final).

[**10.170. Nom.-acc. pl. -iyā?**, probably only by error of tradition. In Suv 28.9 (end of line of vs) text *-koṭiyā*, acc. pl., but v.l. *-koṭayaḥ*; read either this, or *-koṭiyah*, or *-koṭiyo*. Cf. *-īyā* § 10.174.]

10.171. Nom.-acc. pl. -īo, a regular and very common ending for the nom. and acc. pl. of all *i* and *ī*-stems in most Prakrits, especially for fem. nouns, but also masc. (Pischel 377, 380, 387). In our dialect its place is almost wholly taken by *-īyo* (next section), which is substantially the same form, but once at least *-īo* is recorded: *rūpyamayīo* (n. pl., *ī*-stem; no v.l.) Mv iii.228.16 (prose).

10.172. Nom.-acc. pl. -īyo (without regard to saṃdhi; but also *-īyas* etc. with Skt. saṃdhi) is not recorded in Pischel or Geiger, but is much commoner in our dialect than (Pali) *-iyo* or (Pkt.) *-īo*, of which it may be called the normal representative. It is used for both nom. and acc., chiefly with fems., both *i* and *ī*-stems, much more rarely with masc. stems. In most texts only in verses; also in prose of Mv, where the mss. often vary between *-īyo* and *-iyo* (see under the latter § 10.168).

Masc. *i*-stem, nom.: *-dānapatīyo* (mss.; Senart em. °*iyo*) Mv iii.43.8 (prose).

Masc. *i*-stem, acc.: *rāśīyas* (v.l. °*iyo*; construe as acc. with preceding *adrākṣīt*) Mv iii.318.5 (prose).

Fem. *i*-stems, nom.: *oṣadhīyo* SP 127.6 (here °*yaḥ*, final); 129.7; 130.6 (in these v.l. °*yā*); 131.8. — *śaktīyo* (v.l. °*iyo*) Mv ii.88.3 (vs but meter indifferent); *-jātīyo* ii.95.14, 17; 99.17 (all prose); *oṣadhīyo* 353.12; *durgatīyo* 387.10; *gatīyo* iii.377.18 (prose); *śreṇīyo* 442.8 (prose).

Fem. *i*-stems, acc.: *dundubhīyo* (or masc.) SP 331.5 (object of *ninādayanto*; misinterpreted as nom. by Burnouf and Kern). — *sampattīyo* Mv i.32.16; 33.9 (both prose); *durgatīyo* ii.348.13; 385.21.

Fem. *ī*-stems, nom.: *bhikṣuṇīyo* SP 26.9; *koṭīyo ca* 303.3.—(examples all prose) *sapatnīye yo* Mv i.16.8, mss., read *sapatnīyo ye* (or *yā*, nom. pl. fem.); *nadīyo* 21.9; 360.20; *koṭīyo* 59.7; 248.12 and 14; *rūpyamayīyo kiṅkiṇīyo* 195.6; 196.6; *sadṛśīyo dhātrīyo* 227.8; *vāpīyo, puṣkariṇīyo* 308.4; *gurviṇīyo* 308.9; *parivādanīyo* (mss., Senart em. °*dinīyo*) *vallakīyo* 308.11; *mātrīyo* (so read, see Dict. s.v. *mātrī*) *bhaginīyo* 351.4, 8; etc., common.

Fem. *ī*-stems, acc.: *śatāpadīyo* SP 86.1; *nadīyo* 196.9; *-koṭīyo* 253.6, 8. — *nadīyo* Mv i.28.10; iii.55.5; 323.17; *vāpīyo* ii.449.4, 5, 7; *dāsīyo* iii.42.1; *puṣkiriṇīyo* 288.7; *koṭīyo* i.174.16; 175.1 (vss; may be nom.; but in both meter favors v.l. *koṭiyo*); *nārīyo* iii.2.17; 451.9; etc.

Fem. monosyllabic ī-stem, nom.: *strīyo* (in 130.4 v.l. *striyo*) Mv ii.126.10; 130.4 (both prose).

10.173. Nom.-acc. pl. -īya, only in verses, presumably for *-īyo* m.c.; (fem. *i* or *ī* stems) *-koṭīya* SP 251.11; *oṣadhīya* LV 75.20.

10.174. Nom.-acc. pl. -īyā, as nom. or acc. pl. of a fem. ī-stem, uncertain. (Cf. *-iyā*, § 10.170.) SP 237.3 (vs) *bhikṣuṇīyā ca*, ed. with Nep. mss.; but Kashgar rec. *bhikṣuṇikāś ca*. — *piśācanīyā* Mv iii.292.1 (prose), mss., nom. pl. (see Dict. s.v. *piśācinī*, °*canī*); Senart em. °*īyo*.

10.175. Nom.-acc. pl. -īye, cf. the ending *-āye* in the nom. pl. of *ā*-stems (§ 9.92). Rare and somewhat uncertain.

Fem. ī-stems, nom. pl.: *vījanīye* Mv i.222.7 (vs; but Senart em. °*īyo*, with the parallel ii.24.15); *utthāpanīye gāthā* (mss.) ii.26.13 (prose); Senart em. °*īyā*, as if from stem °*nīya*; *puṣkariṇīye* 177.16 (prose), mss. (Senart em. °*īyo*); but it may be an oblique sing. (loc.?); °*īye* to be kept in any case; *-koṭīye* (mss.; Senart em. °*īyo*) 302.7 (prose); *hasantīye* (Senart em. °*īyo*) 425.6 (prose); *paṇḍitāye* (so mss., Senart em. °*āyo*) *strīye* (Senart with v.l. °*īyo*) iii.393.11 (prose); *dhātrīye* (v.l. °*iye*, cf. next; Senart em. °*īyo*) 405.6 (prose).

10.176. Nom.-acc. pl. -iye; possibly only in verses m.c. for preceding, but cf. v.l. in Mv iii.405.6, at end of the preceding. Nom. of ī-stem: *-kumāriye* Mv iii.307.7 = 308.7 = 309.7 (vs). Meter requires short *i*; in the first occurrence v.l. °*ikā*, in the second v.l. °*iyaṃ*; in the third no v.l.; in all three Senart em. °*iyo*.—More than doubtful is *viṃśatiye* SP 115.7 (vs); so text; if correct, acc. pl. of extent of time, 'for twenty (years)'. But doubtless read *viṃśati ye* (§ 21.31).

10.177. Nom.-acc.pl. -ī, one of the regular Pali and Pkt. endings for nom.-acc. pl. of all *i* and *ī* and *in*-stems, of all genders. Geiger 82.1 considers it (in masc. *i*-stems at least) analogical to the *a*-declension. Without denying the possibility of such influence, it seems to me that the main source of the ending is the acc. pl. (Skt. *-īs*) of fem. *i* and *ī*-stems, which was transferred to the nom. and to both acc. and nom. masc. (and nt.).

10.178. In our language this ending is very frequent in all declensional types and genders. In most texts, to be sure, it is restricted to verses, or practically so; in Mv, as usual, it is also common in prose. Prose passages in the following are marked as such.

10.179. Masc. *i*-stems (or, in some compounds, ī-stems), nom.: *paripūrṇacārī ca* SP 13.4; *kṛtāñjalī* 28.9; *śucī* 46.3; 59.1; *maharṣī* 56.6, 198.3; *vinaṣṭadṛṣṭī* 129.2 (followed by *s-*; in same line *viśuddhadṛṣṭayaḥ*); etc., common. — *nāgāvalī* LV 193.5 'having rows of elephants' (so Tib.); *kṛtāñjalī* 236.12; *ratnapāṇī* 299.1; *dharmacarī suraputrāḥ* 364.4; etc. — *jñātī* Mv i.220.19 = ii.23.4 (vs; so meter demands, but v.l. first time and all mss. second time *jñāti*; Senart em.); (*nīla*)*yaṣṭī* i.259.14, 18; 260.3, 5, etc. (all prose; v.l., and sometimes all mss., °*yaṣṭi*); *vanaspatī* (v.l. °*tiḥ*) ii.353.12 (end of line of vs); *dānapatī* iii.45.20 (*ī* required metr.); *sārathī* 120.13 (end of line, v.l. °*i*); *jitārī* 141.2 (end of line, v.l. °*i*); *guhyakādhipatī* 380.11 (end of line, v.l. °*i*). — *asaṅgabuddhī* RP 15.2. — *bālabuddhī* Dbh.g. 7(343).14.

10.180. Masc. *i*-stems, acc.: *durmatī* SP 272.4 (confirmed La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1911.1076); *sūryaraśmī* 126.5 (in both of these meter indifferent as to quantity of final). — *mīḍhaṃgirī* LV 197.3. — *jñātī* Mv i.359.14 (in line 12 *jñātīṃ*).

10.181. Masc. *in*-stems, nom.: *kathaṃkathī* SP 35.4; *na mohavādī* (but WT with Chin. *namo ha vādī*, n. sg. m.) 56.6; *lajjī* 59.1; *hastī* 111.8; *pakṣī* 331.4; etc. — *hastī* LV 28.5; 193.5; *sukhī* 92.15; *praśāntacārī* 219.11; *dhyānadhyāyī* 297.10; *pakṣī* 341.18; etc. — *vipratisārī* Mv i.37.4 (prose); *paragaṇī* 74.3; *-dhārī* 150.13; *-vicārī* 151.4 = 224.15 = ii.27.15; *-tathākārī* i.177.2; *paranirmitavaśavartī* i.212.15 (prose, v.l. °*ti*); ii.360.6; *sukhī* i.289.11 (prose); ii.328.18; *matsarī* ii.52.22 (same vs in Pali, Jāt. v.391.1, *maccharino*); *pakṣī* ii.107.13 (v.l. *pakṣi*), 14; iii.145.7 (v.l. *pakṣi*; all prose); *brahmacārī* ii.210.9; 214.4; 218.14 (all prose); etc., common. — *dve ūrdhvagāmī dvaya heṣṭagāmī* Suv 58.8 (may be considered duals). — *ekākī* RP 13.7; *vanavāsī* 31.18. — *sukhī* Śikṣ 325.6. — *vṛṣabhī* Dbh.g. 4(340).17; *kṛtāvī* 22(358).24. — *-darśāvī* Ud xvi.4 (later var. *-darśino*). — *āvāsī* MSV ii.110.2 ff. (prose).

10.182. Masc. *in*-stems, acc.: *dharaṇītalesmiṃ śayī* LV 194.15 (for *śayinaḥ*). — *lābhī* Mv i.31.1 (prose); 32.1 (prose); in 31.1 *lābhino* also occurs, in same construction; *-kumbhatūṇī* ii.150.4 (prose); *pakṣī* 221.18 (v.l. *pakṣi*, but meter favors °*ī*).

10.183. Fem. *in*-stems: The same form is even used as fem. of (original) *in*-stems: *duḥkhī* Mv iii.285.15, *vipratisārī* 16 (with *māradhitaro*); nom. pl.

10.184. Fem. *i*-stems, nom.: *oṣadhī* SP 129.8. — *prāṇajātī* (v.l. °*ti*) Mv ii.99.2; *śreṇī* iii.161.14 (prose).

10.185. Fem. *i*-stems, acc.: *dvātriṃśatī* SP 68.11; 69.1 (*antarakalpa*; in the first both edd. °*tīṃ*, against all mss. according to KN, who in the very next verse, nevertheless, keep °*tī* in the same phrase!); *nānāniruktī* 130.8. — *kāmaratī* LV 283.12; *vajrāsanī* (for °*śanī*) 339.4. — *apāyabhūmī* Mv ii.333.19 (v.l. °*mi*; meter doubtful).

10.186. Fem. ī-stems, nom.: *śatāpadī* SP 84.2; *dāsī* 111.9; *koṭī* 305.4 (four times); *ratnāmayī* 331.7; *bhikṣuṇī* 384.12, etc. — *sarvanadī ca* LV 77.10 (prose; all mss. are reported showing °*nadī*, before a voiceless stop; Calc. °*nadyaś*); *evarūpa gātha tūryaniścarī* 170.6 (so read, cpd.: 'such verses were proceeding from the musical instruments'); *-koṭī* 196.7; *śaktidhārī* 202.1. — *koṭī* Mv i.338.7; *kiṃnarī* ii.97.21 (prose); *ceṭī* 172.2, 15 (both prose); *bherī* 186.1; *mṛgī* 235.2 (prose); *sadṛśī* iii.222.1 (prose); *rākṣasī* 292.1 (prose); *nārī* 387.9; *puṣkariṇī* 438.20. — *pīṭhī* Divy 221.3 (prose, mss.; before *a-*; ed. em. *vīthyaḥ*). — *grāmacāriṇī* Suv 16.7 (end of line; no ms. has *-ḥ*). — *nadī* Samādh 19.18.

10.187. Fem. ī-stems, acc.: *-koṭī* SP 130.4; *vāpī nadīyo* 196.9 (both acc.); *bhikṣuṇī* 383.12 (end of line). — *koṭī* LV 223.11; *puḍinī* 298.3. — *koṭī* Mv i.125.17; ii.319.22 (both v.l. *koṭi*, meter indifferent or doubtful in both); *nāgī* ii.188.7.

10.188. Neuter *i* and *in*-stems: *nakṣatrā saśaśī* (stem *-śaśin*) *satārakaravī* (stem *-ravi*) LV 284.3. In Skt. and Pali *nakṣatra* (*nakkhatta*) recorded only as nt., so also AMg. acc. to Ratnach. (but Sheth gives both m. and nt.). — *bhikṣuśatāni dhyānalābhī utthāya* KP 138.4 (prose). Masc. form because of *bhikṣu*? But in 139.2 the same phrase has °*lābhiny*.

10.189. Nom.-acc. pl. -i, is much less common than *ī*. It occurs, however, not infrequently, in metrically indifferent positions and in the prose of Mv, from *i*, *ī*, and *in*-stems alike. Senart often, but not consistently, emends to *-ī*. The mss. themselves often vary; under the ending *-ī* some such variants are cited.

Masc. *i*-stems, nom.: *rājāna ye mahipati* (369.3 *kṣitipati*) *cakravartino* SP 35.13; 369.3. — *anurāgabuddhi* Mv i.79.6 (all mss., end of line of vs; Senart em. °*ī*); *ṛṣi* 189.17 (vs, but meter indifferent); *nirmāṇarati* 212.15 (prose; wrongly printed as if part of a cpd.); *praśāntadṛṣṭi yathā* i.151.8 = 224.19 = ii.27.19 (so mss. always; in first two places Senart em. °*dṛṣṭipathā*; in the third he rightly keeps mss. reading); *-pāṇi* iii.366.2 (mss., end of line of vs; Senart em. *-pāṇī*).

Masc. *i*-stem, acc.: *sakhi* LV 165.10.

Masc. *in*-stem, acc.: *loka-vicāri* Śikṣ 330.13 'roaming the world'.

Fem. *i*-stems, nom.: *lipi* LV 146.5. — *vṛṣṭi* Mv ii.92.16 (but meter seems to require *vṛṣṭī*!); *saṃgīti* 151.15;

153.10; 160.19 (all prose). — *-dṛṣṭi teṣu bhonti* RP 11.15; *aṅguli* 24.1.

Fem. *i*-stems, acc.: *nirukti* SP 238.1. — *daśāṅguli* Mv i.204.16 (so with v.l., required by meter); *jāti* iii.27.14 (adverbial acc. pl.); *divyāni saṃpatti* i.31.11 (prose; Senart with 1 inferior ms., out of 6, °*tī*; his note assumes neut. gender for *saṃpatti*; rather, confusion of gender-forms results in *divyāni* going with fem. noun; cf. RP 23.17 below).

Fem. *ī*-stems, nom.: *nāri* LV 202.1 (and in 80.11 *nāri* by em., required by meter, for mss. *nārī*); *tūryakoṭi* LV 222.7; *-koṭi* Gv 254.16.

Fem. *ī*-stems, acc.: *dhāraṇi* SP 294.8; *āntaḥpuri* LV 211.7 ('women of the harem'); *catvāri* (cf. Mv i.31.11 above) *koṭi pramadānām* RP 23.17.

10.190. Nom. pl. -is, -iḥ, etc. The nom. sg. ending of short *i*-stems. It seems to occur as nom. pl., doubtless as a result of the fact that the endings *-ī*, *-i* are used alike for nom. (and acc.) sg. and pl.; hence by analogy the Skt. nom. sg. ending comes to be used as pl. In fact the mss. show such forms more commonly than the editions admit. *śaśir ivā gagaṇe supūrṇāḥ* LV 296.13 'like full moons in the sky'. For *śaśinaḥ*; but here the form might be interpreted as *śaśi* plus hiatus-bridging *-r*. — *caturo nidhiḥ* Mv ii.436.9; 438.1, etc. (prose, no v.l.; repeatedly in the context). — *apramāṇāḥ sattvavimuktir anuvartayitavyāḥ* Gv 458.9 (prose). In preceding line *-dhātur* is similarly used as nom. pl., § 12.57.

Vocative plural

10.191. Voc. pl. -ī, ending of the nom. used as voc.; masc. *in*-stem: *chandakakālodāyī* Mv ii.233.17; 234.2 (both prose). Dvandva cpd., but hardly to be interpreted as dual; plural verbs go with the form.

10.192. Voc. pl. -īho. Cf. *-āho* from *a* and *ā*-stems, §§ 8.88; 9.100. Fem. *ī*-stem: *devīho* (v.l. *devī*) Mv ii.449.16 (prose).

Instrumental plural

10.193. The commonest non-Skt. ending is *-īhi*, very common in Mv prose as well as verse, and occasionally in verses elsewhere. It is the regular Pali and Pkt. ending of all *i*, *ī*, and *in*-stems. Less commonly, but in Mv not rarely, *-ihi* (with short penult) appears; it is recorded for Pali (Geiger 83.8) and Ap. (Pischel 387). Forms in *-ībhi(s)* also occur, even from short *i*-stems, as in Pali ('archaic', Geiger 83.7); and *-ibhi* for *-ibhis* occurs in verses m.c. Forms with final nasal (ending in *-hiṃ* or *-bhiṃ*) do not seem to occur, at least as clearly established readings, tho occasionally they are recorded as variants of individual mss. (e. g. Mv ii.464.14 v.l. *bhaginīhiṃ* for text °*hi*).

10.194. Inst. pl. -īhi, found with all types of *i*, *ī*, and *in*-stems; only in vss. except for Mv, where it is common also in prose (such examples are marked).

Masc. *i*-stems: *munīhi* Mv i.72.10; *yūthapatīhi* 360.6; 361.14 (both prose); *jñātīhi* ii.154.9 (prose); *ṛṣīhi* (v.l. °*ihi*) ii.216.18 (prose); *gajapatīhi* (v.l. °*ihi*) ii.311.2 (prose); *maṇīhi* (vs, but *ī* not required metr.) 360.10; *asīhi* 326.14; iii.19.21; *añjalīhi* ii.352.20; *kṣuravṛttīhi* (masc. adjective) iii.180.8 (prose); *agnīhi* 445.12.

Neuter *i*-stems: *akṣīhi* Mv i.363.18 (prose); ii.234.17 (prose, v.l. °*ihi*).

Masc. *in*-stems: *viparītasaṃjñīhi* SP 281.11. — *pakṣīhi* Mv ii.211.1, 3, 7, 11; 212.13, 14 (all prose); *vikālacārīhi* iii.328.18 (here prob. in sense of loc., cf. § 7.30).

Fem. *i*-stems: *nānāniruktīhi* SP 45.5. — *dvātriṃśatīhi* Mv i.50.2 (prose); *bhūmīhi* (v.l. °*ihi*) 128.9 (prose); *navatīhi* 186.19; *ṣaṣṭīhi* 197.14 (prose); *vikṛtīhi* ii.126.15; 128.2; iii.145.11 (all prose); *-jātīhi* ii.248.16 (prose); *muṣṭīhi* (v.l. °*ihi*) 452.14 (prose); *śaktīhi* (v.l. °*ihi*) iii.19.20; *śreṇīhi* 111.20 (prose).

Fem. *ī*-stems, monosyllabic: *strīhi* Mv iii.149.11 (prose); *istrīhi* iii.84.14.

Fem. *ī*-stems, polysyllabic: *valīhi* SP 313.9.—(all Mv citations prose) *vāsīhi . . . kuṭhārīhi* Mv i.16.14; *droṇīhi* 22.2; *sakhīhi* 217.3; *ceṭīhi* 302.16; ii.171.11 (v.l. °*ihi*); *dāsīhi* i.350.1; *kiṃnarīhi* ii.97.6, 8; 110.3; *puṣkariṇīhi* 171.3; 180.12; *ratnāmayīhi* 180.12; *dhātrīhi* 423.9; *bhaginīhi* (v.l. °*hiṃ*) 464.14; *nārīhi* iii.41.19; *rākṣasīhi* 75.7; 287.4; 290.8. — *-pūṭīhi* Sukh 50.9.

10.195. Inst. pl. -ībhis (etc.), the ending of Skt. *ī*-stems, here applied to *i*-stems, in verses where meter requires *ī*; but also twice, from a masc. *in*-stem, in prose of Gv, *pratisaṃvedībhir* (stem °*vedin*) 377.12 and 19. Others:

Masc. *i*-stems: *kṛtāñjalībhiḥ* LV 297.15; *maṇībhiḥ* Mv ii.319.11.

Fem. *i*-stem: *-ratībhiḥ* (°*bhis*) LV 37.2; 184.15.

10.196. Inst. pl. -ībhi, for the preceding; only in verses, m.c.: *jātībhi* SP 330.6; *-koṭībhi* RP 18.15; *aśucībhi* RP 43.18.

10.197. Inst. pl. -ihi, noted only in Mv, where it is not very rare, tho much rarer than *-īhi*. Examples are all from prose, except those labelled vs. Chiefly from *i* and *in*-stems but, according to the mss., twice from fem. *ī*-stems; in both Senart reads *-īhi*: *vāsihi* Mv i.5.4 (5 out of 6 mss.; from *vāśī* 'axe'); *aṇvantihi* iii.357.10 (mss.).

Masc. *i*-stems; *katihi* Mv i.89.8; *jñātihi* ii.187.9 (vs, *i* required metr.); *maṇihi* ii.311.6 (mss.; Senart em. °*īhi*); *pattihi* iii.433.20 (vs; *i* required metr.).

Fem. *i*-stems: *aśītihi* Mv i.32.7; 38.14 (et alibi); *-koṭihi* 49.12; *bhūmihi* (*i* m.c.) 192.12 and 14 (vss); *paṅktihi* 194.4; 249.14 (mss. in the first, and v.l. in the second, *paktihi*); *viṃśatihi* 307.19 (in line 16 *viṃśatīhi*).

Masc. *in*-stems: *dvīpihi* Mv i.24.16; *sarvaprāṇihi* (repeated with °*bhiḥ* 82.4) 48.8 (vs, end of line); *hastihi* 349.18; *varmihi* (v.l. °*ibhiḥ*) iii.22.9 (vs, end of line).

10.198. Inst. pl. -ibhi, only in vss, m.c. for *-ibhis*: *-ṛṣibhi* LV 163.20 (em.; mss. °*bhiś*); *buddharaśmibhi* Mv iii.274.6.

Ablative plural

10.199. As in Pali and Prakrit, the originally inst. ending *-īhi* is also used for the abl.: *durgatīhi vimokṣitāḥ* Mv i.175.2 (vs); *virakto . . . °ratīhi* ii.145.7 (prose).

Genitive plural.

10.200. The most frequent departures from normal Skt. forms concern irregular quantities of the penultimate *i*. In Skt., all *i* and *ī*-stems have the ending *-īnām*, while *in*-stems have *-inām*; in our dialect each is used often for the other, and not only in positions where metrical requirements determine, in fact in prose, and *-īnām* in other texts than Mv. Furthermore, but only in verses m.c., *-a* may replace the final *-ām*, resulting in endings *-īna* and *ina*, both of which are found with both *i* (*ī*) and *in*-stems. Similarly in monosyllabic *ī*-stems, *-iya* may replace *-iyām*, m.c. Finally, we seem to have a couple of occurrences of nonce-forms in *-iṣām* and *-īm* as gens. pl.; see below. Prose examples are marked as such.

10.201. Gen. pl. -īnām, from *in*-stems: *gṛhīṇām* SP 272.5 (not required metr.); *gaṇīnāṃ mahāgaṇīnāṃ* (no v.l.) 298.5–6 (prose); *maṇḍalīnām* 362.8. — *paranirmitavaśavartīnām* LV 46.21; 150.4 (both prose); *bhūtavādīnāṃ* 91.8 (prose; but v.l. °*dini*, perh. rightly; passage seems confused); *sarvaparapravādīnāṃ* 275.13 (prose); *keśarīṇāṃ* 311.14. — *gṛhīṇāṃ* Mv i.75.17 (not required metr.); *vijitavāsīnāṃ* 276.1; *pakṣīṇāṃ* ii.212.11 (prose); *chandakakālodāyīnāṃ* iii.92.11 (prose; in same passage ii.234.6 °*yināṃ*). — *śreṣṭhīnāṃ* Divy 143.18, 22 (both prose); *dhanīnāṃ* 143.22 (prose). — *gṛhīṇāṃ* RP 29.16. —

khaḍgīnāṃ Mmk 122.7. — *hitaisīṇāṃ* Dbh.g. 4(340).26. — *-vaśavartīnāṃ* Gv 341.1 (prose).

10.202. Gen. pl. -īna, only in vss. m.c. for *-īnāṃ*.

Masc. and fem. *i* and *ī*-stems: *koṭīna* SP 30.13. — *lipīna* LV 146.6; *svapatīna* 159.2; *ṛṣīṇa* 222.20. — *nṛpatīna* Gv 213.4.—In Mv iii.365.8 I would read *saptāna* (so mss.) *rātrīṇa*; the ed. reads *sapta-* (em.), then with mss. *rātrīyena*, which is impossible in meter and at least bizarre in form (but cf. §§ 10.129 and 9.69).

in-stems: *prāṇīna* SP 38.3; *nimittasaṃjñīn' iha* (for °*īna-iha*) 57.7; *ayuktayogīna* 93.11; *nimittacārīṇa* 120.3; *viparītasaṃjñīna* 326.5; *balacakravartīn'* (*atha*) 362.8. — *cakravartīna* LV 311.14 (so, one word). [— *gṛhīṇa* RP 29.11 (but see Dict. s.v.).]

10.203. Gen. pl. -inām, from *i* and *ī*-stems. Noted in prose only in Mv.

Masc. *i*-stems: *bālabuddhinām* SP 57.7; *maharṣiṇām* 70.5. — *ṛṣiṇām* LV 402.11; *kāśināṃ* 406.10, 12, 14. — *dhurabuddhinām* Mv i.86.2 (mss.; Senart *dhuta*°); *vipulabalavarakīrtināṃ* 136.13 (prose); *varabuddhināṃ* 168.5; *maharṣiṇāṃ* 169.11 (here meter demands °*īṇāṃ*!); ii.194.14; iii.434.9 (prose); *kāśināṃ* ii.184.2; *-sārathināṃ* iii.241.1.

Fem. *i*-stems: *-koṭināṃ* SP 12.10; 45.3 (or *ī*-stem). — *saṃgītinām* LV 109.7; *lipināṃ* 125.7. — *caturaśītināṃ* Mv ii.424.10; *aśītināṃ* iii.126.7 (both prose). — *-koṭināṃ* Samādh 8.31 (or *ī*-stem).

Fem. *ī*-stems (cf. *koṭi* or *koṭī*, above): *nāriṇāṃ* LV 179.5; 240.17; *kinnariṇāṃ* (so!) 214.18.

10.204. Gen. pl. -ina, m.c. for *-inām*.

i-stems: *munina* (separate from the following *ye*) LV 421.18; *dundubhina* Mv i.71.8.

in-stems: *dhyāyina agrā* LV 169.5, 'O best of meditaters!'; *-saṃjñina sattvānām* Śikṣ 324.16.

10.205. Gen. pl. -iya, m.c. for *-iyām*, in monosyllabic *ī*-stems: *istriya* LV 193.14 (separate from following *māya*; 'women's wiles').

10.206. Gen. pl. -iṣāṃ, once in Mv prose, *bhāryāpatiṣāṃ* iii.148.13 'of wife and husband'. It is not strange that Senart queries the form. It might be due to influence of *s*-stems, like the inst. *balasā, padasā* for *balena, padena,* (see § 8.41); to be sure *is*-stems (like *jyotis, havis*) are much less common than *as*-stems, and I do not think of any that would be specially apt to have influenced *pati*. Or could the *-sām* ending of pronouns be involved? Pischel 370, 381, explains the Ap. gen. pl. ending *-haṃ* (regular in all declensions) as borrowed from that source.

10.207. Gen. pl. -īm, once, Gv 478.16 (vs), for *-inām*, from an *in*-stem: *sarvajinānāṃ saṃkhyāṃ cintenti anāvaraṇacintīm*, 'they reflect on the number of all the Jinas that have unobstructed thoughts'; stem *-cintin*. The regular form *-cintinām* would be hypermetric. Cf. *-ān*, *-āṃ* as gen. pl. ending of *a*-stems, § 8.124. —Once this ending seems even to be elided (before *i*-): *udyāna* (q.v. in Dict.) *dhāraṇ' ita* . . . Dbh. g. 20(356).11, 'a garden of dhāraṇīs'.

Locative plural

10.208. Loc. pl. -īṣu, regular in Skt. with *ī*-stems, is common here also with *i*-stems, but in most texts only in verses where meter requires a long penult. As usual Mv has also prose instances, which are marked here as such.

Masc. *i*-stems: *-yonīṣu* Mv i.27.3, 12 (prose; in 4 and 10, same vicinity, also v.l. in 12, *-yoniṣu*); *upadhīṣu* iii.444.15.

Fem. *i*-stems: *-bhittīṣu* SP 51.3, 7; *-ratīṣu* 88.5; *yonīṣu* 97.2; 358.13. — *-ratīṣu* LV 323.6; *durgatīṣu* 372.19. — *guttīṣu* (for *guptiṣu*) Mv i.20.6; 23.1 (both prose); *gatīṣu* i.53.14 (the same passage printed as prose i.337.5 reads *gatiṣu*; if verse, meter requires *gatīṣu*); *bhūmīṣv-* i.102.9 (not m.c.; cf. *bhūmīṃ* in line 8); *saṃpattīṣu* ii.141.10 (not m.c.); *jātīṣu* 220.2; 363.2; 365.16; *durgatīṣu* 328.22; *ratīṣu aratīṣu ca* iii.59.2. — *ratīṣu* Samādh 19.21; *-gatīṣu* Suv 48.1, 2, 4; Bhad 16, 20; Gv 236.10.

10.209. Loc. pl. -iṣū and -īṣū, *ū* only m.c.: *vidhiṣū* Gv 55.3; *gatīṣū* SP 9.6; 48.3.

11. Feminines in -*ā* and -*ī*

11.1. There are cases of fems. in -*ā* where Skt. would use -*ī*, and vice versa.

11.2. The use of -*ā* for Skt. -*ī* corresponding to masc. stems in -*a* has been noted chiefly in ordinal numerals. All the ordinals from 4 to 10 present *ā*-stem forms, where Skt. uses only *ī*-stems. Perhaps this is due to the analogy of Skt. *prathamā*, *dvitīyā*, and *tṛtīyā*. AMg. has (besides *ī*-forms) *cautthā*, *pañcamā*, and *chaṭṭhā* (Pischel 449). Here we find *catuthāya*, m.c. (?) for *caturthāyāṃ*, loc. sg., Dbh.g. 16(352).8; *pañcamā* Mv ii.240.5; iii.306.21 (but in the same vs LV 388.19 *pañcamī*); *ṣaṣṭhāyāṃ*, loc. sg., Mv i.127.1, 4; *ṣaṣṭhāto*, abl. sg. fem., Mv i.127.14; *saptamā* Mv ii.240.6, °*māṃ* id. i.127.14; °*māyāṃ*, loc. sg., id. i.127.2, 4; *aṣṭamā* Mv ii.240.6; *navamāṃ* Mv i.142.2; *daśamāṃ* Mv i.142.3; 193.12 (here Senart em. °*mā*).

Further, *tādṛśā* appears for Skt. *tādṛśī*: *tādṛśīye lakṣmīye tādṛśāye vibhūṣāye* Mv ii.157.9 (note that the form of the adjective follows that of its noun); *tāṃ tādṛśāṃ mama vadhūṃ* LV 138.18 (so all mss., except one *tādṛśā*).

And there are even feminines in *ā* to -*ant*, -*mant*, and -*vant* stems; see § 18.9, 11, 36, 40, 47.

11.3. We find -*ī* for Skt. -*ā* in pres. mid. pples: *araṇyakuṭikāye chādyamānīye* Mv i.328.1 and 16 (prose; so mss. both times; Senart em. °*nāye*); *kaṭṭīyamānī* Mv ii.429.15; *yudhyamānī* iii.371.3 (vs) 'fighting' (in same vs in Pali, Jāt. v.142.32, *yujjhamānā*).

In past pples., suffix -*ta*: *prakṛtī*, fem. to °*ta*, 'mentioned, under discussion': *prakṛti* Mv i.232.16 (for °*tī*, nom. sg.); *prakṛtiye* id. 233.14, gen. sg.; °*tiye* id. 238.3, instr. sg. All prose.

vṛddhī? Nom. pl. *vṛddhyaḥ*, RP 41.18 (prose); meaning not clear, perhaps 'skilled, adept' (sc. in erotic arts?). But the text may be corrupt.

Miscellaneous: *vayasyī*, to *vayasya*: °*yīye*, gen. sg., Mv ii.249.8 (prose); *uttarī* = *uttarā*: LV 28.18 (vs) *kuttottarī* (text °*ntarī*), i. e. *kuta(ḥ) uttarī*, 'how (much less a woman) superior?'; *acetanī* = Skt. °*nā*: nom. pl. °*nyo* LV 119.22 (prose); *anopamī* = Skt. *anupamā*, Mv i.166.12 (vs). Even the noun *devatā* appears also as *devatī* repeatedly in Sādh (see Dict.). And *vikurvī* for the more usual *vikurvā*, 'miracle', may occur once (Dict.).

12. U and ū-stems

12.1. The declension of *u*- and *ū*-stems is similar to that of the *i*- and *ī*-stems thruout, only somewhat simpler. They are, of course, less common; distinctions between nouns of different genders, and between those which in Skt. belong to different declensional types, are perhaps even harder to discover. The most important distinction is in the oblique singular cases, where fem. nouns rather often show the MIndic endings *-ūya*, *-uya*, *-ūye*, *-uye*, or the like; they are rarely found in masculines and neuters. But between *u*- and *ū*-stems the distinction (by no means rigid even in Skt., Wackernagel III § 101) can no longer be demonstrated. We shall include here MIndic *u*-stems which in Skt. belong to other declensional types, *us*-stems (*cakṣu*, etc.) or others such as *vidu* (*vidvāṃs*: *viduṣ*), *maru* (*marut*). However, *u*-stem forms from *ṛ*-stems will be treated under *ṛ*-stems, §§ 13.21–28.

Forms with intrusive *-n-*

12.2. Neuter *u*-stems in Skt. contain, in the oblique cases of the singular, an intrusive *-n-* (e. g. abl.-gen. *madhunas*), analogical to nt. *i*-stems, which got the *-n-* from *in*-stems. In BHS this *-n-* spreads to masc. *u*-stems. They show, first, abl.-gen. sg. forms in *-uno*, *-unaḥ* (as masc. *i*-stems also show *-ino*, *-inaḥ*, § 10.81); and then, by analogical extension, nom. pl. *-uno*, and acc. sg. *-unam* or (m.c.) *-una* (*i*-stems also have nom. pl. *-inas*, *-ino*, § 10.155; perhaps also a stray nom. sg. *-inas*, § 10.3; I have failed to note any acc. sg. *-inam* except from *in*-stems, cf. § 10.3). Pali has sporadically a masc. acc. sg. *bhikkhunaṃ*, *-bandhunaṃ* (as well as gen. *bhikkhuno*, and rarely nom. pl. *-uno*). Geiger (83.1) calls it analogical to *in*-stems, but notes with surprise that Pali (like BHS, as I noted above) does not seem to show **agginaṃ* or the like in masc. *i*-stems. This suggests to me that the influence of *in*-stems on these forms is only indirect, as indicated above. The acc. sg. *-unaṃ* is analogical to abl.-gen. *-uno*, which is taken over from the Skt. neuters.

12.3. Finally, it appears that this acc. sg. ending, analyzed as *-una-m*, has begotten a loc. sg. *-une*, as if to a stem *-una* (cf. the stem *-ina*, instead of *-in*, § 10.3).

Stem form in composition

12.4. Twice, at least, we seem to find *-us* (in the forms *-ur*, *-uḥ*) for *-u* as stem in composition. This may be a reflex of the frequent use of *-u* as stem final instead of *-us*, in composition (and otherwise). Cf. however the use of *-as* (*-aḥ*) for *-a* in composition, § 8.12. I have not noted any use of *-is* as stem final of *i*-stems. *dīrghabāhurgarvitaḥ* LV 310.20 (prose), n. of a son of Māra, 'Proud-of-long-arms'; so all mss. and both edd.; *hetuḥpratyayataḥ* 324.22 (vs), all mss. and Calc.; Lefm. em. *hetu-pra°*, but meter demands a long syllable, and *pr-*, as initial, would hardly satisfy this need. The word is certainly a cpd.

12.5. Once, in Mmk, occurs a nom. sg. masc. of an *u*-stem in *-avaḥ*: *siddhihetavaḥ* Mmk 495.11 (vs) (= *°hetuḥ*). It obviously belongs with the forms in 'stem' *-aya* from *i*-stems found in the same text (§ 10.7).

12.6. ū for u as stem-final in composition: only noted in verses, where required by meter (but this is probably not significant): *bahūvidha-* SP 274.2; 334.10; *dṛṣṭāntahetūnayutāna* 9.12; 116.6. — *bandhūjanena* LV 188.13; *-mṛtyūbhayaiḥ* 216.1; *madhūpāyasaṃ* 271.7. — *guggulūrasam* Suv 104.8 (so read with v.l. for ed. *°lu°*).

12.7. u for ū as stem-final in composition: only noted in verses, m.c. (cf. the preceding): *amaravadhunibhāṃ* Mv ii.4.1. Note that in the same line i.143.8; 200.4 the mss. have *°vadhū°*; Senart emends to *°vadhu°* m.c.

Nominative singular

12.8. The commonest ending is *-u*, as in Pali. Less common is *-ū*, which is standard in Pkt. Forms of clearly fem. nouns, and particularly of *ū*-stems, are not common; they can not be said to demonstrate any clear preference for *-ū* as against *-u* (nor the contrary). Most of the examples I have noted are masc. Some of these are masc. cpds. ending in (originally fem.) monosyllabic *-ū* stems, but these even in Skt. normally become *u*-stems (type *svayaṃbhu*). My fem. examples are so few that I shall cite them all together. I shall include *dhātu* and its cpds.; it has either masc. or fem. gender here, as in Pali (acc. to Childers; PTSD only fem.). And one or two other words which in Skt. may be either masc. or fem. are included. The forms in which meter demands or favors a short or long syllable are marked m.c.; but note that the Skt. ending *-ūs* is as good metrically as *-ū*, and so is *-us* or its equivalent before a consonant.

12.9. Nom. sg. fem. -u: *kaṇḍu* SP 96.16 (vs, m.c.; 'gewöhnlich *kaṇḍū* f.', pw); *phalgu* 44.14 (vs, metr. indifferent). — *camu* LV 352.21 (to *camū*; vs, m.c.). (In LV 30.3, prose, Weller 18 would read *lokadhātu* as a separate word, nom. sg. But I would read with Foucaux's ms. A *caturmahādvīpako*, see his Notes 94, for the preceding word, otherwise with Lefmann's text.) — *iṣu* RP 7.13 (vs, m.c.; masc. or fem.).

12.10. Nom. sg. fem. -v, in saṃdhi before vowel: (anuṣṭubh vs) *jarjarā lokadhātv eyaṃ* (= *iyaṃ*) SP 306.7. Cf. (anuṣṭubh vs) *paśyate lokadhātv* (acc. sg.) *emām* (= *imām*) 355.4.

12.11. Nom. sg. fem. -ū (as with masc., not limited to vss): *ākāśadhātū ca* SP 330.14 (vs). — *camū* LV 317.5 (prose; all mss., only Calc. *camūr*; not noted in Weller); 337.16; 360.13, 14 (all vss). — *śvaśrū* (followed by *a-*) Mv ii.444.6 (prose). — *vadhū* MSV ii.68.16 (vs).

12.12. Nom. sg. fem. -uṃ (?), perhaps to be read with Kashgar rec. in SP 31.9 *sacaiva sarvā iya lokadhātuṃ* (end of pāda), *pūrṇā bhavet . . .* 'if this whole world system were full . . .' Certainly nom. sg.; Nep. mss. *lokadhātuṣu*; KN em. *lokadhātu*, kept in WT without note. The form is precisely parallel to *-iṃ* in *i*-stems, and must be explained similarly; see § 10.23. Cf. *picuṃ* § 12.30.

12.13. Nom. sg. masc. -u: SP (only in vss., m.c.): *vidu* SP 25.4; 26.5; *pāṃsu* 158.2; *-abhibhu* 190.1; *-hetu* 190.14; *śiśu* 313.7. — *vāyu* IV 340.17 (vs; all mss. and Lefm.; Calc. *vāyur*, which is more in accord with custom in meter; occurs at end of a pāda, but in this meter that syllable is generally made long); (others only m.c.) *vidu* 46.16; *meru* 53.10; 308.8; 330.3; *vindu* 74.5; *jara vyādhir mṛtyu* 191.8, read as separate words; *-ketu* 292.3; *svayaṃbhu*

6*

420.16. — *vāyu* (followed by *u*-) Mv i.16.15 (prose); *guru* 27.6 (prose); *bhikṣu* 35.13; 244.12, 15 (all prose), etc.: *pānsu* 94.16 (= *pāṃsu*; vs but not m.c.); *bandhu* 156.3 (vs, m.c.); ii.229.5 (vs, not m.c.; followed by *a*-); *valgu* i.194.12, 14; 196.8 (all prose); *subāhu* ii.100.14 (prose) etc.; *sudhanu* 103.15; 110.1, 9, 18 etc. (all prose); *kṛṣṇabandhu* 338.11 (vs, end of line, not m.c.); *ikṣvāku* iii.4.7 (vs, not m.c.); *hetu* 43.11 (prose); *bindu* 87.4 (vs, m.c.). — *guru* RP 22.1 (vs, m.c.); *āśukelu* 24.14 (vs, m.c.).

12.14. Nom. sg. masc. -ū: mostly from historic short *u*-stems; even forms from *-abhibhu*, *-vibhu* probably not to be correlated with the Skt. (original and) alternative *-bhū*. Except in Mv, only noted in vss m.c.: *gurū* SP 166.6; *lokavidū* 166.10; *bhikṣū* 282.3; 284.11. — *merū* LV 120.9. — *sarvābhibhū* Mv i.38.13; 39.1, 3, 7 (all prose; followed by vowel; the reading seems well supported tho there are vv.ll., °*bhūr*, °*bhu*, and others); same iii.118.8 (vs, m.c.; the following word is recorded in mss. as *sarvavidu*, but meter demands °*vidū*, which Senart reads); *vibhū* i.118.15 (vs, m.c.); *sumerū* i.301.2 (vs, end of line, not m.c.); *viśuddhacakṣū* ii.383.1 (vs). — *vidū* Gv 208.16 (vs, m.c.).

Vocative singular

12.15. Voc. sg. -u, in Mv (and Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka, cited in Śikṣ; this text contained prose resembling that of Mv) in prose, otherwise in vss m.c. All masc. *bhikṣu* LV 242.22; *naramaru* 362.4 and 11. — *mahābāhu* Mv i.191.7 (vs but not m.c.); *svayaṃbhu* 247.11 (vs, may be m.c.); *bhikṣu* 330.12; ii.297.9, 10; iii.180.13 (all prose); *kṛṣṇabandhu* ii.238.16; 335.23 (both vss but not m.c.); *ikṣvāku* iii.2.10 (vs, not m.c.); *reṇu* iii.206.17, 18 (prose). — *bhikṣu* Śikṣ 154.17, 18 (prose, from Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka).

12.16. Voc. sg. -ū, only recorded in vss, in most texts m.c. but in Mv not always. Mostly masc. but also *-vadhū* (for which however the Skt. voc. is *vadhu*). Also (masc.) cpds. of *-bhrū*. *lokavidū* SP 162.5. — *vikasitabhrū* LV 210.7; *subhrū* 235.1; *gajahastorū* 235.3; *abhīrū* 284.18. — *vibhū* Mv i.112.14 (vs, m.c.); 175.1 (vs, not m.c., end of line); *-vadhū* i.147.1 = 203.16 = ii.7.12, also i.147.5 (mss. *-vadhūr-iti*) = 204.3 (v.l. *-vadhūḥ*) = ii.7.18 (v.l. *-vadhuḥ*; vs, not m.c., end of line); *pramādabandhū* ii.334.5, repeated 335.3 and 11 (vss; the mss. vary between *-ū*, *-u*, and *-uṃ*; Senart reads always *-u*; but meter seems to require *-ū*).

Accusative singular

12.17. Like the nom. sg., the acc. follows roughly the pattern of *i*-stems. But the only 'irregular' form much used is *-u*, identical with the same form in the nom. and doubtless transferred thence. It occurs with both masc. and fem. nouns. On the other hand *-ū*, fairly common in the nom., has not been noted in the acc. with masculines and hardly occurs with feminines. As with the nom., I shall list first the few forms that occur with fems.

12.18. Acc. sg. fem. -u: *dhātu* SP 99.1. — *kāmadhātu* LV 45.15; *iṣu* 357.14 (masc. or fem.); *camu* 366.1 (*ū*-stem in Skt.). — *yāgu* Mv i.298.10 (vs, end of line, not m.c.; Senart em. *yāguṃ*); *priyaṅgu* ii.210.10 (prose, no v.l.; in Skt. masc. or fem., but in Pali fem.).

12.19. Acc. sg. fem. -ū: *candrārkatārāgaṇa bhū pateta* LV 253.18 (vs) 'moon, sun, and host of stars might fall to earth'; m.c.? (the regular Skt. *bhuvaṃ* would spoil the meter). — *-karṣū* Mv ii.409.7 (vs; v.l. °*u*; long syllable required metr.; Senart em. °*ūṃ*; Skt. *ū*-stem); *vadhū* ii.444.7 (prose; v.l. *vadhu*; Senart em. *vadhūṃ*).

12.20. Acc. sg. fem. -uṃ, of stems regularly ending in *-ū* in Skt.: *camuṃ* Mv ii.260.10 (prose); *śvaśruṃ* ii.445.19; 449.3 (both prose).

12.21. Acc. sg. fem. -uyam (? textually not certain, see below), in a polysyllabic *ū*-stem; cf. the oblique fem. endings *-uya*, *-uye* etc., and the ending *-iyaṃ* in (fem.) *i* and *ī* stems (§ 10.63), by which this (like the oblique *-uya*, *-uye*) may well have been influenced. *śvaśruyam* Mv iii.10.13 (prose; to *śvaśrū*). So Senart with one ms.; the other reads *śvaśruram*, which might also stand, as a form based on the analogy of nouns of relationship (*mātaram* etc.). The one certain thing, in my opinion, is that the text should not be emended to the Skt. form.

12.22. Acc. sg. masc. -u, well attested, and in Mv prose; otherwise only noted in verses m.c. *bhikṣu* SP 98.10; 280.12; *pāṃsu* 235.12; *-hetu* 313.6; *meruṃ sumeru sarvā* (mss. *sarvāś*) *ca* 355.5 (most mss. *sumeruṃ*, which is inferior tho possible metrically, in the first pāda of an anuṣṭubh). — *meru* LV 134.5; 202.19 (in the latter, most mss. *merur-utpāṭya*, perhaps to be interpreted as containing 'hiatus-bridging' *r*); 297.3; *kleśaripu* 156.6; *pāṃśu* 190.15. — *bāhu* Mv i.18.3 (prose); *ikṣu* 21.6 (prose); *hetu* iii.139.17 (vs, m.c.). — *taru* RP 26.20.

12.23. Acc. sg. masc. -ūm, from a (masc.) cpd. of *-bhū*: *sarvābhibhūm* Mv i.38.7, 9 (prose).

12.24. Acc. sg. masc. -unam, as in Pali (Geiger 83.1 *bhikkunaṃ*, *-bandhunaṃ*); see § 12.2: *dharmaketunam* (stem *-ketu*) Mmk 365.17 (vs).

12.25. Acc. sg. masc. -una, m.c. for preceding: *bhikṣuṇa vīkṣya ca guṇāḍhyaṃ* RP 29.9 (vs).

12.26. Acc. sg. masc. -uvam, the ending of monosyllabic *ū*-stems, occurs once in a normal *u*-stem: *mahāvīryaṃ prabhaviṣṇuvam* Mmk 135.2 (vs) 'the heroic Lord'. The meter is bad; regular *prabhaviṣṇum* would give eight syllables, but wrong cadence (in the even pāda of an anuṣṭubh).

12.27. Acc. sg. masc. -us; cf. *-is* in *i*-stems (§ 10.60); either the nom. sg. used as acc., or transfer from the *us*-declension. *senāpatiṃ namuci siṃhahanuś ca nāmnā* (. . . *paripṛcchati*) LV 303.1 (vs), 'and Namuci (Māra) asked his general named Siṃhahanu'. Only Calc. has °*hanuṃ*, tho all mss. agree on *senāpatiṃ*! Cf. also the v.l. *merur* for text *meru* in LV 202.19, § 12.22, which however (if adopted in the text) could intend *meru* plus 'hiatus-bridging' *r*.

Nominative-accusative singular neuter

12.28. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -ū, occasionally for *-u* in verses m.c. *-bhaiṣajya bahū analpakam* SP 13.12; *bahū puṇya bhaveta teṣām* Sukh 46.7.

12.29. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -um, -uṃ, much more commonly used than the preceding when, in verses, a long final is required; also in prose and in metrically indifferent positions. Like *-iṃ*, *-im* with *i*-stems, common with neuters in Pali and Pkt. Occurs also with original *us*-stems, particularly *āyu* = *āyus* (cf. § 16.42). Thus, *āyuṃ*, nom.-acc. sg., SP 330.10 (vs; so read with v.l. of KN and with WT; KN ed. *āyu*, unmetrical); 336.1 (vs, but here meter is indifferent; in 336.6, vs, ed. *āyur acintiyam* but several mss. *āyum a*°); 336.12 (vs, so ed., but here mss. mostly *āyu*; meter indifferent); LV 110.3 (vs); Mv i.106.3; 117.2; 119.5 (all vss, but meter requires long final only in 117.2). — *dharmacakṣuṃ* LV 179.4 (vs). — *cakṣuṃ* Mv i.167.15 (vs); ii.374.16 (vs); iii.177.8, 10.

12.30. In all the preceding, of course, the regular Skt. form in *-us* (*-ur*, etc.) would be prosodically equivalent to *-uṃ*. The following concern *u*-stems; all verses except as specified: *bahuṃ* SP 111.7; 229.8, 13; *laghuṃ* 192.4 (at end of line; Kashgar rec. *laghu*). — *laghuṃ* LV 46.4, 16; 91.21; 314.13 (in these at end of lines); 109.16; 322.3; 358.19; *bahuṃ* 203.7 (end of line); *madhuṃ* 387.4; *rohitavastum* 406.19 (prose; acc. sg.; cpds. of *-vastu* are regularly nt.; followed by *a*-). — *bahuṃ* Mv i.13.15; 14.12; 37.7; 86.7; 101.13 (all these either prose or at end of

lines or otherwise in metrically indifferent positions); *abhiyavastuṃ* (nom.) 45.16 (prose); *kapilavastuṃ* (nom.) 47.15 (prose); *laghuṃ* 75.8, 12 (end of lines); *vastuṃ* 352.3; iii.413.16 (both prose); *madhum* (before *a*-) i.341.7 (prose); *asādhum etam* ii.272.9 (prose) 'this is bad'; *lahuṃ* (v.l. *laghuṃ*) iii.2.17 (end of line); *keśaśmaśrum* (before *a*-) 92.5 (prose); *kālavastuṃ* (nom.) 360.1. — *agaruṃ* (nom.) Śikṣ 65.14 (prose). — *tat picuṃ saṃśodhayitavyam* (nom.; *picu* in Skt. masc.) Mmk 55.21 (prose). — *atarum* (before *a*-; nom.) Gv 133.25 (prose). — The best ms. at Ud vii.5 (end of line) reads (*kuśalaṃ*) *bahūṃ*, which if genuine would be isolated, as far as I know (§ 12.23 is different); it is probably an error for *bahuṃ*.

Oblique singular: distinctively masculine-neuter forms

12.31. Essentially the same conditions hold here as in the oblique singular of the *i*-stems, q.v. (§ 10.64). We present first forms which are primarily masculine or neuter, and appropriate to particular cases; then those which are primarily feminine, and for the most part applicable to any oblique singular case.

12.32. Inst. sg. -ūnā. The ending *-ūnā*, instead of *-unā*, from the stem *sarvābhibhū*, seems well attested (despite some variation in the mss.) in *sarvābhibhūnā* Mv i.40.6, 12; 41.1 (prose). (Cf. the gen. *-ūsya* below). Otherwise it has not been noted except in Lefmann's em. *iṣūṇā* LV 168.7, where *ū* seems demanded by the meter, tho all mss. and Calc. read *iṣuṇā* (or °*nā*).

12.33. Abl. sg. -uno, the ending of neuters in Skt., is found (as in the gen., see next) with a masc. noun, *hetuno* Mv i.120.11 (prose) 'by reason' (all mss.; Senart implausibly em. *hetuśo*).

12.34. Gen. sg. -unaḥ, -uno, as in the preceding, and as in Pali and Pkt. *-uno*. Chiefly in verses, but once at least in Mv prose. See above, § 12.2: *-bandhunaḥ*, °*no*, Mv i.185.18; ii.319.13; *svayaṃbhuno* i.357.8; *-vidhuno* i.220.12 = ii.22.13; *jugutsuno* iii.438.2 (prose); *bhikṣuṇo* 452.14. — *mṛtyunaḥ* Divy 68.20 = 300.22 = Av i.5.7 etc. (vs). — *jantunaḥ* Ud iii.5; *bhikṣuṇo* vi.13.

12.35. Gen. sg. -usya, parallel to *-isya* from *i*-stems, §§ 10.78–80. The Sanskritizing orthography *-uṣya* (like *-iṣya* for *-isya*) occurs a number of times in Mv (where Senart keeps it, contrary to his practice with *iṣya*, which he emends to *-isya*) and in SP (sometimes with v.l. *-usya*); some mss. are reported to read so also in Bhad 42, 43; even so it is relatively rare. The ending *-usya* is common in prose of Mv, and occurs once in that of Gv; it is also cited in Śikṣ from prose of the Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka, which contained the same sort of prose as Mv. The SP and Bhad examples are from verses. I have failed to note any from other texts. *lokaviduṣya* SP 31.7; *agurusya* 50.7; *devadārusya* 50.8; *lokaviduṣya* 118.9; *agarusya* 331.3; *māṃsacakṣuṣya* 355.10 (v.l. °*sya*); *agaruṣya* 362.5 (1 ms. °*sya*). — *-cakṣusya* Mv i.159.2 (prose); *-vastusya* 193.13 (prose); *bhikṣusya* i.36.11; 329.21; 330.10; 335.3; ii.273.12 (all prose) etc.; *siṃhahanusya* i.352.13; 355.19 (both prose); ii.37.17 (vs), but *siṃhahanuṣya* ii.76.4 (prose); *dhanuṣya* ii.76.10 (prose); *brahmāyusya* 77.12; 78.16 (prose), but *brahmāyuṣya* 78.17 (prose); *subāhusya* 95.5; 98.5; 101.4 etc. (all prose); *sudhanusya* 99.15, 17; 110.13; 112.16 etc. (all prose); *ketusya* ii.354.21 = iii.279.5 (vs); *mahāvastusya* ii.397.7 (prose); *subandhusya* 420.9; 421.1, 11 (all prose); *ikṣvākusya* 425.14 (prose); *agurusya* iii.96.5 (vs). — *vidusya* (v.l. °*ṣya*) Bhad 42, 43 (vss). — *bhikṣusya* Śikṣ 154.20; 155.1 (prose, from Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka). — *bimbahusya* Gv 106.16 (prose).

12.36. Gen. sg. -ūsya appears well attested in Mv from the *ū*-stem *sarvābhibhū*; cf. the inst. *-ūnā* above. In Mv i.36.6 Senart reads *sarvābhibhusya*, but 2 mss. °*bhūsya*; the mss. are more favorable to °*bhūsya* in i.37.8, where Senart still has °*bhusya*; but in 37.11, 38.5, 44.8, 45.2 Senart adopts °*bhūsya* with preponderant ms. evidence.

12.37. Gen. sg. -o, MIndic for *-os*, *-oḥ* (or perhaps corruption?). *bhikṣo* Mv i.39.8 (prose), followed by *idam*; kept by Senart; *vālaheto* ii.222.12, followed by *d*-, mss., Senart em. °*hetor*.

12.38. Loc. sg. -usmin or -usmiṃ, like *-ismin*,*-ismiṃ* from *i*-stems (§ 10.84; and cf. Pali *-usmiṃ*), is well attested in Mv, prose as well as verse; otherwise it has been noted only once in a verse of SP. The nouns are only masc. and nt. with one exception; *camusmiṃ* Mv ii.173.6 (prose), apparently from the stem which in Skt. is *camū*, and which seems to be fem. even in Mv (*etāṃ camuṃ* ii.173.12); see Dict. *pāṃsusmin* SP 236.6.—Mv (all prose except the first): *-vidusmiṃ* i.235.16 (vs); *kapilavastusmiṃ* 239.7; 352.10; ii.3.17; 31.6; 48.4; 74.4, etc.; *bhikṣusmiṃ* i.323.10; iii.103.7, etc.; *dhanu-tsarusmiṃ* ii.73.8; *tharusmiṃ* 74.3; *dhanusmiṃ* 73.16; 74.2; 434.12; iii.184.7; *vastusmiṃ* iii.91.17; *tsarusmiṃ* 184.8 (so Senart em., mss. *sarusmiṃ*).

12.39. Loc. sg. -une, as if to a stem *una*; see § 12.3. I have recorded only (*śrī-*)*mahāvastune*, Mv ii.206.19 (prose, no v.l.); also one ms. in ii.237.16 (omitted by Senart with v.l.), and mss. in i.1.2, where Senart emends to °*vastuye* with the mss. at i.2.14. It would have been better to emend the latter to °*vastune*; I know of no parallel to such a form as *-vastuye* (quasi-feminine) from this stem. Aśokan has loc. *-une*: Hultzsch cxvii (otherwise Bloch, Aśoka, 62, 167 n. 10).

Oblique singular feminine

12.40. As in MIndic generally, fem. *u*-stems have in all the oblique sing. cases endings modelled on those of the *i*- and *ī*-stems. The regular ones are Pali *-uyā*, Pkt. *-ūa*, *-ūe*; in addition the loc. often has *-aṃ* for the final vowel. The number of instances I have noted in BHS is, naturally, much smaller than in the case of the far commoner *i*- and *ī*-stems, but runs a similar gamut; see § 10.87. We shall present first forms in *-ūye*, *-uye*; then *-ūya*, *-uya*; then *-ūyo*, and finally *-ūyaṃ*, primarily belonging to the loc. alone.

12.41. Obl. sg. -ūye. This and *-uye* (see next) have been noted only in Mv. Both are found in prose (all examples of *-ūye* are prose); the mss. sometimes vary between *ū* and *u*, and there is no evidence to discredit either (just as *-īye* and *-iye* are both well established with *i*, *ī*-stems). Inst.: *tejodhātūye* Mv i.357.17.—Gen.: *yvāgūye* Mv. ii.84.10.—Loc.: *lokadhātūye* Mv ii.301.12; and in line 9 above one ms. reads so, Senart with v.l. °*tuye*; id. Mv ii.314.10 (v.l. °*tuye*).

12.42. Obl. sg. -uye. Besides those noted under *-ūye*, we find the following, all but one from prose (all Mv): Instr.: *śvaśruye* ii.454.17; 455.12.—Gen.: *śvaśruye* iii.9.15; *durbalacakṣuye* (fem.) iii.132.15.—Loc.: *lokadhātuye* i.166.10 (vs; *u* could be m.c.).—On *mahāvastuye*, mss. and ed. at Mv i.2.14 (prose), apparently loc. of *mahāvastu*, cf. § 12.39.

12.43. Obl. sg. -ūya, unlike *-ūye* (*-uye*), is found in various texts besides the Mv; but, except for Mv, only in verses. It may be noted that in the *i*, *ī*-stems the corresponding *-īye* etc. is the prevailing form in Mv, while *-īya* etc. seem preferred in some other texts. Inst.: *dadrūya*, *kaṇḍūya* SP 112.6 (stems *dadrū*, *kaṇḍū*).—Abl.: *lokadhātūya* SP 126.1.—Gen.: *jambūya* LV 134.2 (separate *mūrdhni*); *lokadhātūya* Sukh 46.5.—Loc.: *lokadhātūya* Mv ii.353.4 = iii.277.7 (vs); and read so in Mv ii.281.16 (prose) with one ms. (v.l. °*dhātau-ya*) for Senart's em. °*dhātau ye*.

12.44. Obl. sg. -uya: Inst.: *śvaśruya* Mv ii.445.17; 454.5; iii.9.3 (all prose).

12.45. Obl. sg. -ūyo (cf. *-īyo*, § 10.113). Gen.: *lokadhātūyo* Mv ii.350.3 (vs, *ū* metrically necessary).

12.46. Obl. sg. -ūyaṃ, -ūyam, primarily loc., but like *-īyaṃ* (§ 10.141) also used in gen. sense. Loc.: *lokadhātūyam* (v.l. °*yaṃ*) Mv i.214.12 (prose), before vowel. Note the shortened *a* before consonantal *m*, even in prose. —Gen.; *śvaśrūyaṃ* Mv ii.444.6; 445.5 (both prose), so mss. both times (one °*uyaṃ* the second time); Senart emends the first time to °*uye*, the second to °*ūye*.

Nominative-accusative plural

12.47. While the number and variety of forms here recorded is naturally much smaller than in the corresponding section of *i, ī*-stems, the same considerations (§ 10.148) impel me to group together the endings of these two cases in all genders.

12.48. Nom.-acc. pl. -avaḥ (-avo), the Skt. nom. pl. masc. and fem. ending, is also used as acc. pl. (examples noted only in verses, and all masc.): *ṛtavo* SP 91.3; (*buddhān*) *bahavo* 207.10. — *bhikṣavaḥ* LV 421.7 (with *kṛtvā*). — *sugatān bahavo* RP 15.4. — *vijinanti sarva ripavo* Gv 213.9.

12.49. Nom.-acc. pl. -ava, only in verses m.c. for the preceding; examples (nom. pl. masc.): *bahava* LV 421.22; *bhikṣava* RP 17.14.

12.50. Nom. pl. -uvaḥ, as in monosyllabic stems: *madguvo*, n. pl. f., MSV ii.86.2 (prose).

12.51. Nom.-acc. pl. -uno, analogical to *-inas, -ino* in *i*-stems, and to *-uno* abl.-gen. sg. (cf. § 12.2). So rarely in Pali, Geiger 83.5, but quite commonly in Pkt., Pischel 380. In BHS rare. Noms.: *bhikṣuno* Mv i.192.10 (vs; so we must read with Senart's em. for *bhikṣuḥ na*, unmetrical reading of mss.); *svayaṃbhuno* 338.5 (vs).

12.52. Nom.-acc. pl. -ūna, m.c. for *-unaḥ* (preceding). Cf. *-īna*, § 10.159. *tathaiva bhikṣūṇa ca bhikṣuṇī ca upāsikāś cāpi mi* (read with WT *cāp' imi = cāpi ime*) *mahya saṃmukham* SP 384.12 (vs). The parallel nouns prove that *bhikṣūṇa* is nom. pl. (not partitive gen. with *pañcaśatā* in preceding line).

12.53. Nom.-acc. pl. -ūni, with m. and f. nouns: *bahūni* (*bālāni*, nom. m.) Mv ii.92.7; (*māyāni*, acc. f.) 174.12; *tāni iṣūṇi* (acc.) iii.362.9. Cf. § 6.9.

12.54. Nom.-acc. pl. -uni, is reportedly written rather frequently in the mss. of Mv for *-ūni*, neut. nom.-acc. pl.; Senart always emends (rightly?). Thus *mṛduni* Mv ii.470.13 (prose) mss.; Senart *mṛdūni*.

12.55. (Nom.-)acc. pl. -uṃ, -um corresponds to *-iṃ* in *i*-stems, § 10.166. Usually emended by Senart, and doubtless by other editors. In Mv i.328.9 (prose) Senart keeps *tāṃ bhikṣuṃ* (= *tān bhikṣūn*) with mss.; but in i.334.10 and 16 he emends to *bhikṣūṃ*, and in i.335.1 (prose, before a vowel) he emends *bhikṣum* to *bhikṣūṃ* (with anusvāra for *-m*). Again in i.337.1 mss. *bahuṃ* or *bahu*, Senart em. *bahūṃ*; and in ii.186.2 Senart em. *veṇū* for mss. *veṇuṃ* or *veṇu*. All acc.

12.56. Nom.(-acc.) pl. -ūs, -ūḥ, the Skt. ending of the acc. pl. of fem. *u*- and *ū*-stems (also of the nom. sg. of *ū*-stems), is used as nom. pl. of masc. as well as fem. *u*-stems. Cf. the similar use of *-īs* with *i*-stems, § 10.167, and of *-ūs* as voc. pl., § 12.62.

Masculine: *svayaṃbhūḥ* (v.l. °*bhū*) SP 47.10 (vs); *paśūś caiva* SP 111.8 (vs); *bhikṣūḥ* Mv i.328.3, 6 (prose).

Feminine: *dhātūś ca* RP 44.15.

12.57. Nom. pl. -uḥ. Cf. the similar use of *-iḥ*, § 10.190, and see under *-ū*, § 12.60, for which *-uḥ* often occurs as v.l. in mss.: *saṃcinvanti . . . viduḥ* (all mss.; Senart em. *vidūḥ*) Mv i.87.8 (end of line of vs); *ye tatra nirmita bhikṣuḥ na caite bhikṣuno matā* (v.l. *mataḥ*) 192.10 (vs), mss.; Senart em. *nirmitā bhikṣūḥ*. Certainly nom. pl. is meant. — *apramāṇāḥ sattvāśayadhātur anupraveṣṭavyāḥ* Gv 458.8 (prose). In next line *-vimuktir* (§ 10.190) is similarly used as nom. pl.; the two forms confirm each other.

12.58. Nom.-acc. pl. -ūyo and -uyo. Seems to occur only with fems.; parallel to (and imitations of) *-īyo, -iyo* in *i*-stems (which however also occur with masc.), see §§ 10.168 ff. Not many examples noted, but enough to demonstrate the reality of both endings. Mv i.80.11 and 13 has in close proximity *lokadhātuyo* and °*tūyo*, acc., in prose; no v.l. for the first; only two inferior mss. °*tuyo* for the second. The form *lokadhātuyo* as acc. again in Mv ii.315.9 (prose), *lokadhātūyo* as nom. ii.350.3 = iii.274.5 (vs), both without v.l.; in verse, metrical conditions might be concerned. — *dhenuyo* (acc., no v.l.) Mv iii.42.3 (prose).

12.59. Nom.-acc. pl. -ū and -u; the really common non-Skt. endings are these, parallel to *-ī* and *-i* in the *i*-stems, qq.v. §§ 10.177 ff., 189. Perhaps *-ū* is somewhat commoner than *-u*, tho this is not so clear as with *-ī* in comparison with *-i*. In any case both seem well established in the prose of Mv and either in prose, or at least in metrically indifferent positions, of various other texts. No preference between the two seems to be shown by any particular gender or declensional type. Prose passages will be marked as such.

12.60. Masc. nom. *-ū*: *bhikṣū* SP 11.13; 26.9; 272.10; 273.8; *bahū* 26.9; 86.11; *avidvasū* 45.9; 204.6 (both end of pādas, not m.c.); *lokavidū* 47.10; 193.1; *marū* 208.9; *ṛjū* 324.3; *vidū* 325.4 (end of pāda, not m.c.).—The form *bhikṣū*, nom., is extremely common in Mv, tho not so common in the mss. as in the edition of Senart, who usually substitutes it for mss. readings *bhikṣu* (see below), *bhikṣuḥ, bhikṣur* etc. (see § 12.57). The mss. themselves often vary between these forms. A few instances, in which there is at least some ms. support for *bhikṣū* (but often vv.ll. as above), are (all prose) Mv i.267.4; 317.18; 328.15, 16 (Senart em. °*ūṇāṃ*); ii.48.14; 82.4; 83.13; 89.12, 14; 166.15, 17; 177.4, 7 (in 4 one ms. *bhikṣū-m*, with 'Hiatus-bridging' *m* before vowel); 209.4, 8; 234.10, 13; 241.10, 11. —Other forms: *bahū* Mv i.10.3 (vs); *khāṇū* ii.350.18 (vs, but metr. indifferent); *bandhū* iii.68.16 (prose); *vibhū* 101.2 (vs). — *bahū* Samādh 22.18 (vs, but metr. indifferent). — *bhikṣū* RP 30.10. — *svayaṃbhū* Gv 258.15.

Masc. acc. *-ū*: *valgū . . . śabdān* SP 358.8. — *kleśaśatrū* LV 195.14. — *bahū* Mv i.42.11; *bhikṣū* i.323.8; iii.102.12 (both prose; in both v.l. *bhikṣu-m*, before vowel, with 'Hiatus-bridging' *m*, or as in § 12.55).

Fem. nom. *-ū*: *nāgavadhū* LV 284.9; *lokadhātū* Sukh 45.12.

Nt. nom.-acc. *-ū*: *aśrū* Mv ii.217.16 (prose; v.l. *āśu*, intending *aśru*?); *bahū* Samādh 19.21.

12.61. Masc. nom. *-u*: *vidu* SP 56.7; *paramāṇu* 158.6; *samantacakṣu* 176.10; *bahu* 255.7; 341.14 (both vss but meter indifferent); *mṛdu* 324.3; 325.9. — *maru* LV 81.7; *naramaru* 165.5; *dīrghanakhaśmaśru* 211.12 (? cf. Weller 28; prose; this should be read as a separate word, and is either nom. pl. masc., or acc. sg. nt. adverb); *vimalaketu* 296.17; *vidu-m-āhuḥ* 324.1 ('Hiatus-bridging' *m*; Tib. mkhas pas smras, 'the sages say'); *pṛthu* 330.14.—Mv: the form *bhikṣu*, nom. pl., is very common in the mss.; Senart usually, but not always, emends to *bhikṣū* (cf. above). There follows a small selection of examples, all prose, mostly emended by Senart; none of the mss. read *bhikṣū* in these (one or two have v.l. *-ur*); i.246.8; 319.1, 6; 328.11; 329.19; ii.67.15, 17; 69.6; 77.1; 83.15; 94.15, 17.—Others: *bahu* i.15.1; *veṇu* 235.14; *maru* 241.18 (also iii.96.17; 100.18, v.l. *maruḥ*); *aśruvindu* ii.213.17 (prose); *mṛdu* 263.10 (prose). In several of these Senart em. °*ū*. — *bahu* RP 31.16. — *vidu* Dbh.g. 7(343).10, *ripu* 20.

Masc. acc. *-u*: *bahu* SP 54.1; 62.10; *bhikṣu* 383.12. — (*svakān api*) *bāhu* (one ms. *bāhū*) *prasāritān na paśyanti* LV 51.14 (prose; both edd. print *bāhuprasāri*-

tān as a cpd., which is impossible; cf. Weller 19, whose solution is not the right one); *te madhutarpaṇam ikṣu likhitakāṃś cādāya* 382.10 (prose; Lefmann again prints *ikṣulikh°* as a cpd.; not noted in Weller; immediately preceded by *likhitakāś cekṣavaḥ*, nom. pl.; there are variants but the reading is well supported). — *bhikṣu* KP 141.2, 5, 6 (all prose).

Fem. nom. *-u*: *maruvadhu* LV 81.3; *-dhātu* Mv i.126.12; ii.352.12 (both vss, but metr. indifferent; in the second Senart em. *°tū*).

Fem. acc. *-u*: *sarvadhātu nityā* Mv i.90.1 (prose) mss., Senart em. *°dhātū anityā* (*-ū* is uncalled-for).

Nt. nom.-acc. *-u*: *jānu* LV 50.1 (could be called dual); *kariyā bahu* LV 169.4; *cakṣu nipatanti* Mv ii.72.18 (prose).

Vocative plural

12.62. Voc. pl. -ūḥ (?). Cf. same ending in nom., § 12.56: *bhikṣūḥ* (v.l. *°uḥ*) Mv ii.357.1 (prose).

12.63. Voc. pl. -o, apparently the ending of the voc. sg. used as voc. pl., patterned on the extensive identity of nom. and acc. forms in sg. and pl. Noted only in *bhikṣo* SP 146.4 (vs) 'O monks!' So Kern translates without comment; Burnouf apparently assumes a gen. sg. KN suggest em. to *bhikṣūḥ* or *bhikṣavo* (which would be possible metrically). WT keep without note.

Instrumental plural

12.64. The endings *-ūhi* (rarely *-ūbhi*) and *-uhi* (rarely *-ubhi*) are quite parallel to the corresponding *i*-stem forms (§§ 10.193 ff.). As with the *i*-stems, we find such forms with short *-u-* only in Mv, in spite of regular Skt. *-ubhis*. In Mv prose; otherwise only in verses.

12.65. Inst. pl. -ūhi: masc. and nt. *u*-stems: *hetūhi* SP 45.6; 63.7; *bahūhi* 111.12. — *paraśūhi* Mv i.5.4 and 8 (both prose); iii.455.4 (vs); *bahūhi* ii.97.6; 98.10; 109.17 (all prose); *bhikṣūhi* ii.166.15; 209.4; iii.431.4 (all prose; v.l. in first two *°ubhi*, in third *°uhi*); *cakṣūhi* ii.445.8 (prose; in same context 444.14 mss. *°ūhi* and *°uhi*; 444.20 *°uhi* only).

Fem. *u* and *ū*-stems: *vadhūhi* Mv i.203.12 (vs; repeated ii.7.8 with *vadhūbhi*, mss.; *ū*-stem); *jambūhi* ii.250.3 (vs, metr. indifferent; v.l. *°uhi*; *u* or *ū*-stem); *dhātūhi* (*u*-stem) iii.144.6 (prose).

12.66. Inst. pl. -ūbhi: *hetūbhi* LV 176.5; in LV 364.20 *marūbhi* (or *°hi*) seems required by meter; text *marubhi* without v.l.; *vadhūbhi* Mv ii.7.8 (vs), see preceding §; *gurūbhi* Śikṣ 112.13.

12.67. Inst. pl. -uhi, only in Mv and mostly prose (vss marked): *saṃgrahavastuhi* i.3.12; *svayaṃbhuhi* 10.11 (vs; meter requires *u*, but 5 of 6 mss. *°ūhi*; repetition iii.455.5 *°uhi* without v.l.); *tarakṣuhi* i.25.1; *jānuhi* 360.13 (locative in sense); *bhikṣuhi* ii.48.10; *aśruhi* 429.13 (prose); iii.3.3 (vs, metr. indifferent; Senart em. *°ūhi* in both); *cakṣuhi* ii.444.14, 20 (v.l. *°ūhi* in 14); *dhenuhi* iii.42.3; *maruhi* 267.16 (vs).

12.68. Inst. pl. -ubhi: *marubhi* Mv i.100.9 (vs).

12.69. Inst. pl. -ubhīr, before vowel, for *-ubhir*, m.c.: *bahubhīr acintyair* SP 385.3 (vs).

Genitive plural

12.70. Gen. pl. -ūna, only m.c. for *-ūnām*: *lokadhātūna* SP 166.7; *marūṇa* LV 337.10; *bhikṣūṇa santike* (v.l. *bhikṣuṇam antike*) Mv ii.188.10 (end of anuṣṭubh line); *marūṇa* ib. 322.1.

12.71. Gen. pl. -unāṃ, -unām, not only m.c. but (like *-ināṃ* from *i*-stems, § 10.203) also in prose of Mv: *bhikṣuṇāṃ* SP 56.10. — *maruṇāṃ* LV 129.19. — *bhikṣuṇām* (before vowel) Mv i.329.16 (prose); *bhikṣuṇāṃ* ii.258.15 (prose); iii.63.15 (prose); *bandhunāṃ* ii.232.11 (vs); once *bhikṣuṇāṃ* in prose of RP, 56.13 (misprint?).

12.72. Gen. pl. -unam, -ūnam, with short *a* of ultima m.c., followed by vowel. Only in verses, in final of anuṣṭubh lines: *bhikṣuṇam antike* Mv i.282.5; ii.93.19; iii.137.11 (and v.l. of ii.188.10, § 12.70). The quantity of the *u* makes no difference metrically; in the first passage Senart em. *bhikṣūṇam*. — *bhikṣūṇam antike* Mv ii.237.6; iii.89.22.

Locative plural

12.73. Loc. pl. -ūṣu, only m.c. for -uṣu: *bahūṣu* SP 10.9; *dhātūṣu* 51.9; 324.1; *bhikṣūṣu* 94.2; *lokadhātūṣu* 158.3. — *lokadhātūṣu* Samādh 22.40.—In Mv i.70.7 Senart properly em. *marūṣu*; mss. *maruṣu*, unmetrical.

13. Ṛ-stems

13.1. Our language reflects MIndic conditions here as elsewhere. In nouns of the Skt. *ṛ*-declension, MIndic phonetic and morphological processes lead to sweeping alterations in the system. In various ways such nouns, in MIndic and in our dialect, often are converted into *a*, *i*, and (especially) *u*-stems. It seems best to present each group of such cases as a unit, and we shall begin with them. Afterwards we shall present other 'irregular' forms, case by case; they include both phonetic and morphological developments, some of which are very interesting, and not all of which are paralleled in known MIndic vernaculars.

13.2. Since this method of presentation results in separation of different forms of these nouns in the same case, there is here appended a conspectus or key by which those interested may discover the different ways, not recognized in normal Skt., in which each case may be formed.

Stem in composition, §§ 13.4, 8, 19, 20, 22
nom. sg., 13.4, 5, 6, 15, 19, 23, 30
voc. sg., 13.9, 31
acc. sg., 13.10, 18, 24, 32
nom-acc. sg. nt., 13.17, 32
general oblique sg., 13.11, 15, 18, 33
inst. sg., 13.15, 17, 25, 38
abl. sg., 13.26
gen. sg., 13.4, 15, 27, 39, 40
gen. dual, 13.15
nom. pl., 13.12, 13, 18, 41
acc. pl., 13.12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 42, 43
inst. pl., 13.17, 44
gen. pl., 13.18, 28, 45
loc. pl., 13.46

Stems in *-a* for *-ṛ*

13.3. Sporadically, as in Pali (Geiger 90.4, 91.3) and Prakrit (Pischel 391), we find *a*-stem forms replacing *ṛ*-stems, thru simple replacement of stem-final *ṛ* by *a* (as prior member of compounds), or of final *-ar* (as in the vocative) by *-a*, both MIndic phonetic processes.

13.4. As stem in the prior member of compounds, we thus find *napta* = *naptṛ* in Mv i.348.9 (prose) *napta-pranapti-kāye* 'in the crowd of his near and remote descendants'. So read with mss.; Senart misunderstands and emends erroneously; on *pranapti* (= *pranaptṛ*) see § 13.20. Similarly Dbh.g. 7(343).1 *śāsta-caraṇaṃ* = *śāstṛ°*. The name *Māndhātṛ*, which occurs in that form in BHS as well as in Skt. (see Dict. s.v.), also appears as *Māndhāta*: nom. sg. *Māndhātaḥ*, Mvy 3558; *°to* Mv i.348.9; Divy 210.20; 214.20 (all prose); note that *ṛ*-forms occur in the same Divy context (*°tā* nom. sg. 210.23; 214.21; cf. *°tuḥ* gen. sg. 278.13; 576.10); gen. sg. *māndhātasya* Mv i.348.9; Divy 210.21; 213.23 (all prose); Mmk 609.1 (vs; cf. *Māndhātā* nom. sg. 608.22, vs).

13.5. Perhaps here belongs *mahāyajñayaṣṭaḥ* LV 112.11 (prose) 'offerer of great-sacrifices', if *yaṣṭaḥ* is nom. sg. of *yaṣṭa* = *yaṣṭṛ*. (There is in our dialect a *yaṣṭa* = *iṣṭa* 'sacrificed'; but I do not see how it could be concerned here. The variant *mahāyaṣṭayajñaḥ* of most mss. seems questionable, but perhaps could mean 'a great one-that-has-offered-sacrifices'.)

13.6. In verses, nom. sg. forms in *-a* may stand for *-ā* m.c., rather than for *-aḥ*, *-as* etc. A few examples: *kartā na karta iti* LV 337.2 (vs; note preceding *kartā* from stem *kartṛ*); in Mv i.69.6 (vs) *śāstā* is written in mss. but last syllable should be short; Senart em. *śāstu*; perhaps rather *śāsta*?—In Sukh 23.2 (vs) *śāsta* is read in text with 1 ms.; the others *śāstu*, cf. § 13.23.

Stems in *-ā* for *ṛ*

13.7. Rather different is the passage of *ṛ*-stems into the *ā*-declension, or at least use of *ā*-declension endings with them. This phenomenon (also familiar in MIndic, Geiger 91.3, Pischel 389 ff.) is nearly (yet not wholly! see below) limited to feminine *ṛ*-stems, and unquestionably started from the nom. sg., where such a fem. form as Skt. *mātā* was naturally reinterpreted as an *ā*-stem. (Note the converse influence of *ṛ*-stems on the word *bhāryā* 'wife', § 9.25.) Consequently we find:

13.8. Stem -ā in composition: *mātāpitaraṃ* (acc. sg.), *mātāpitṛṇāṃ* (gen. pl.) Mv i.348.16, 17 (prose) '(mother-and-father =) family, relatives, home-folks' (and adj. *mātāpitṛka*, see Dict.). And even with a masculine noun: *śāstābhūtaṃ* Gv 495.15 (prose), 'acting like a teacher' (*śāstṛ*; said of *bodhicittam*). Cf. Wackernagel, II.1 § 19 f. (p. 47).

13.9. Voc. sg. -e: *kuladuhite*, Kashgar rec. and Lüders ap. Hoernle MR 147, for SP 264.9 (prose) *kulaputri* (v.l. *bhagini*) of both edd. with Nep. mss.; *āryadhīte* (no v.l.) Mv ii.172.16 (prose). And even with a masculine, *dharmabhrāte* Mv iii.350.18 (prose; in lines 19, 20 *dharmabhrātā* as voc.). Pali also has such forms as *satthe* (= *śāstar*), Geiger 90.5.

13.10. Acc. sg. -āṃ (-ā): *mātāṃ duhitāṃ* LV 29.4; (*bodhisattva-*) *mātāṃ* Mv i.212.4, 13, 14; 213.4; iii.132.12 (all prose); *dhītāṃ* Mv i.356.12; ii.65.6; 73.5 (all prose) etc. And (as in acc. sg. of *ā*-stems) *mātā* LV 50.4.

13.11. Oblique sg.: *mātāye* Mv ii.469.20; iii.176.16 (both prose, inst.); id. (gen.) Mv iii.131.14; 358.3 (both prose); *ekamātāyaṃ* Mv ii.450.18; 453.6 (loc.; both prose; in 453.6 v.l. *°tāya*, which Senart reads both times); *-dhītāye* (gen., loc.; note *-duhituḥ* 263.17) Mv ii.66.1; 88.15; 263.16 (all prose).

13.12. Nom.-acc. pl. -ā(s); i. e. *-ā*, not always interpretable as saṃdhi-form for *-ās*; also *-a*, m.c.: *grāmika-duhitā ābhiḥ* LV 265.6 (prose); *mātā svasā pitara* . . . *bhrātā* LV 341.19 (vs; all nom. plurals); *-dhīta* (nom. pl., m.c. for *-ā*) LV 170.13 (vs); *pitaraṃ me kauśalyaṃ pṛcchesi mātu-svasā pi* Mv ii.189.13 (prose; so mss., acc. pl. dvandva).

13.13. And with masculine stems (besides *bhrātā*, just above): *anubhoktā* (before *n-*; nom. pl.) LV 324.18 (vs); *mātapitā* (before *m-*; acc. pl. [dual?]) RP 55.7 (vs).

Stems in *-ra* (*-rā*, *-rī*) for *-ṛ*

13.14. More often, *ṛ*-stems are brought into the *a*-declension by extension. That is, the 'stem' adds *a* (or fem. *ā*, *ī*) to *r*, *ar*, or *ār*; for it may be thus added to all these forms of the Sanskrit stem.

13.15. Of these, the rarest are extensions in *-a*, or rather in fem. *-ā*, *-ī* (in the only cases noted; see § 19.8 for *tisra-*), added to the zero-grade stem, resulting in stem

finals in (fem.) *-rā, -rī*. The former (possibly blend of stems in *-tṛ-* and MIndic *-tā-*) seems to exist in stems *mātrā* = *mātṛ*, *dhītrā* = (*dhītā, dhītar* =) *duhitṛ*; the latter has been recorded only in stem *duhitrī* = *duhitṛ*. Also with *a*, m.c. for *ā*.

neha mātra na pitā na bāndhavā RP 38.9 (vs), 'there is here no mother or father nor kinsmen'; *mātra* m.c. for *mātrā* = *mātā*, nom. sg. (note that **māta* would do just as well metrically!).

kula-(ddhi, below line)*-trāya*, Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra in Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 94.2, read (*kula*)*-dhītrāya*, general oblique (inst.) sg. of stem *dhītrā*.

The stem *duhitrī* for *duhitṛ* is recorded several times (Dict.), in the inst. and gen. sg., gen. dual, and acc. pl.

Stems in *-ara* (*-arā, -arī*) for *-ṛ*

13.16. Commoner, with nouns of relationship (which in Skt. have *-ar*, not *-ār*, as stem final in the strong cases), are forms implying a stem *-ara*. The starting point doubtless was the acc. sg. *-aram*, which in fem. nouns may appear in our dialect as *-arām*; these two forms then lead to other forms implying stems *-a, -ā*. (On fem. nouns with masc.-nt. endings see § 13.17.) Prakrit has forms of this sort (Pischel 391 f.), but they seem not to be recorded in Pali (cf. Geiger 91.1). Cf. the general oblique forms in *-are, -ari* (§§ 13.33 ff.), which seem to be different in character. All our examples are from prose except those specified as vs.

13.17. Masculine (and neuter) forms, stem -ara: Inst. sg.: *bhrātareṇa* Mv ii.82.11; *pitareṇa* Mv ii.111.2; 113.11; 437.8; iii.405.13.

Acc. pl.; *bhrātarāṃ* (i. e. °*rān*) Mv iii.428.9.

Nt. nom.-acc. sg. (dual dvandva): *mātāpitaraṃ* Bbh 118.25, 27 'mother-and-father'.

Once, perhaps, from a noun of agent in *-tṛ* (Skt. strong stem *-tār*): *praṇetareṇa*, inst. sg. (but v.l. °*tāreṇa*) Mv ii.218.3.

Even feminine nouns may have masc.-neut. endings. These are perhaps analogical to the acc. sg. *mātaram* (etc.), which resembles a masc. or nt. *a*-stem: *mātarair* Mmk 136.20 (vs; = *mātṛbhiḥ*, which would be as satisfactory metrically); *dhītareṇa* Mv iii.39.17 (v.l. *dhītaro*, which seems not construable); *sapta dhītarāṃ* Mv i.356.17 (= °*ān*; repeated line 18 as *dhītaro*!); *dhītarāṃś caiva* ii.367.21 (vs); and, it seems, even n. sg. *dhītaro* Mv iii.88.18, 20; 89.12 (here Senart em. °*tā*), 14.

13.18. Fem. forms, stem -arā (-arī): But more often fem. nouns imply stems in *-arā* (or possibly, once, *-arī*), starting with the acc. sg.: *mātarāṃ* Mmk 33.12 (vs; before consonant; *mātaraṃ* equally good metrically); *dhītarāṃ* Mv iii.146.4; same form (v.l. °*taraṃ*) iii.284.3; in 284.17 *-dhītarāṃ* should also be read with one ms. (the other has completely altered the passage; Senart emends [or misprints?] *-dhītāraṃ*).

Oblique sing.: *-dhītarāya* Mv ii.58.2 (so read with mss., cf. Jāt. v.403.4–5; loc.); *dhītarāye* (inst.) ii.111.14.

Nom. pl.: *dhītarāḥ* LV 53.1 (vs); *mātarāḥ* Mmk 21.12; 44.10, 20 (all prose).

Acc. pl.: *dhītarā* (for °*ās*; before *s*-) Suv 63.3 (vs); *svāṃ duhitarī* LV 320.1 (mss. so, or °*tarīm* or °*tṝn*; acc. pl.; Lefm. em. °*tṝr*; prose).

Gen. pl.: *dhītarāṇaṃ* Mv i.356.6 (MIndic for °*rāṇāṃ*).

Stems in *-āra* for *-ṛ*

13.19. In both Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 90.3; 91.1; Pischel 389 ff.) we find more commonly 'stems' in *-āra*, from nouns (chiefly of agent) with Skt. strong stems in *-ār*. The Skt. acc. sg. in *-āram* was the starting-point. In our language however they are not very common.

Stem -āra in composition: *śāstāra-saṃjña* LV 232.5 (vs); *śāstāra-vādin* Mv i.254.1 (prose); *śāstāra-pratijña-* Mv iii.383.17.

Nom. sg. *-āro* (m.c. *-āru*): *trātāru* SP 451.4 (vs); *pratigrahetāro* Mv iii.54.16 (prose).

Acc. pl.: *rāja-kartārāṃ* (= °*ān*) Mv iii.207.9 (prose).

Stems in *-i* for *-ṛ*

13.20. In Prakrit (Pischel 389 ff.), stems in *-i* as phonetic replacement of *-ṛ* are not rare. In our language they hardly occur. I have noted only *napta-pranapti-kāye* Mv i.348.9 (prose; so mss.; § 13.4), where *napta* = *naptṛ*, *pranapti* = *pranaptṛ*; and cf. *jāmātiko*, for *jāmātṛ-kaḥ*, Mv iii.146.5, 9, 12 (and *jāmātuka*, § 13.22).

Stems in *-u* for *-ṛ*

13.21. On the other hand, stems in which *-u* similarly appears as phonetic replacement of *-ṛ*, which are common in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 90.2; Pischel 389 ff.), are also quite common here. The abl.-gen. in *-u* for Skt. *-uḥ* is of course not counted here, tho it very likely had some influence in creating the apparent 'stem' in *-u*.

13.22. Stem in -u in composition: *śāstu-pūgaṃ* (mss. °*pūjā*) Mv i.126.3 (vs); *śāstu-bimbam* Mmk 131.26 (vs, but metr. bad). Cf. also *jāmātuka* = °*tṛ-ka*, AMg. *jāmāuya*: *jāmātukasya* Mv iii.24.18 (prose); *praveṣṭuka* Mmk 49.12, seemingly for **praveṣṭṛ-ka*, 'one who enters' (Dict.).

13.23. Nom. sg. -uḥ or (more often) -u: *mama bhartu sahāyakas* LV 235.7 (vs; wrongly interpreted by me in HJAS 1.70); *pitu mama śuddhodaneti nāmnā* 243.3. — *bhartu rājā* Mv i.207.13 (vs; text not certain; probably read *śruṇi* for *śṛṇuya*, in which case meter seems to require *bhartū*); *mātu* ii.14.12; 26.1 (both prose), in 26.1 read with mss. *bodhisattvo ca māyā ca mātuḥ sārdhaṃ śivikā samārūḍhāḥ*, § 7.60. — *śāstu* Sukh 23.2, perhaps to be read with v.l. for text *śāsta*, § 13.6.

13.24. Acc. sg. -uṃ (or -u, m.c.): *mātāpituṃ* Mv ii.230.13 (vs); *śāstuṃ* 361.6 (vs); *mātuṃ* iii.130.12 (prose); *pituṃ* 406.15 (prose). — *śāstu* Mmk 134.12, 16 (vss).

13.25. Inst. sg. -unā, once from a feminine stem: *pitunā* Mv ii.101.4 (prose); *kuladuhitunā* Śūraṃgamasamādhisūtra, Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 126.1 (prose).

13.26. Abl. sg. -usmā (?), apparently for *-usmāt*, with masc.-nt. pronominal ending, but in a fem. stem: *mātusmā* Mv ii.38.12 (vs); so Senart with one ms.; the other seems to have a mere corruption of this. But the syntax is not too clear.

13.27. Gen. sg. masc. -uno (as in *u*-stems, § 12.34). All verses except those marked prose: *śāstuno* Mv i.68.18 (note *śāstu*, gen., line 16); 306.19; ii.297.1 (°*naḥ*, prose); iii.401.15; Mmk 103.13; 431.7; 586.10; Gv 34.14; *bhartuno* Mv i.207.11; ii.12.15; *pituno* Mv iii.105.13.

13.28. Gen. pl. -unāṃ (as in *u*-stems, § 12.71, in vss; the short *u* may be m.c. only): *śāstunām* LV 172.17. — *śāstunāṃ* Mv i.70.3, so read with most mss.; Senart em. *śāstuḥ*.

Miscellaneous forms of *ṛ*-stems

13.29. The remaining forms are miscellaneous; they are derivable from Skt. *ṛ*-stem forms either by MIndic phonetic alterations, or by analogic morphological processes which are in part also paralleled in recorded MIndic. Some of these latter are however unexampled elsewhere, and of no little interest.

13.30. Nom. sg. -ās (?). Once, in Mv i.312.9 (prose), the mss. present a nom. sg. ending in *-ās*; is it analogical to masc. *-as* stems? *śāstāś ca* (Senart em. *śāstā ca*). Cf. § 17.51.

13.31. Voc. sg. -ā, borrowed from the nom. So also in Pali (Geiger 90.5) and Prakrit (Pischel 391, see especially end, *Culaṇīpiyā*). *bhrātā* Mv ii.460.18; iii.69.8; *dharma-bhrātā* Mv iii.350.19, 20 (in 18 °*bhrāte*). All prose.

13.32. Acc. sg. -ṛ, neuter dvandva; *nahi bhūyu mātṛpitṛ drakṣyati putradārāṃ* LV 190.20 (vs), 'he will not again see mother and father, son and wife'. Most mss. read so, but A, the best, *mātapita*, which would belong above, § 13.3. It seems to be meant for a nt. sg. dvandva, tho this would be unusual in Skt.; the individuals, rather than a collective group, are meant.

13.33. Oblique singular -are, -ari. Without precedent in any Mindic known to me are forms in *-are*, *-ari* (both used only in prose, the variation hence not due to meter) which seem to be used for any oblique singular case-form. The forms which occur are *pitare, pitari, mātare, mātari*, and perhaps *dhītare*. Senart, note i.603, regards *pitare* as 'a mere orthographic variant of *pitari*', and the latter as an instance of loc. used for inst. But neither suggestion is satisfactory. The ending *-e* is commoner than *-i* in these forms, and the loc. is not likely to be the starting-point; the inst. usage, tho common, is not exclusive, even with the addition of the loc., for there are clear genitives, perhaps also one dative. It seems to me that we have here common oblique-singular forms of the *ṛ*-declension, analogous to *-āye, -āyi, -īye, -īyi, -ūye, -ūyi*, or with short penultimate vowels, especially *-iye, -uye*, etc., in the fem. *ā, i* and *u*-stems; and probably formed in imitation of them, just as in Skt. the acc. pl. endings *-ṝn, -ṝs*, and the gen. pl. *-ṝṇām*, were formed in imitation of *-īn, -īs, -īnām, -ūn, -ūs, -ūnām*. The exclusively short *a* in the penult would be consistent with the non-occurrence of *-ār-* in the nouns of relationship concerned. It is true that masc. as well as fem. *ṛ*-stems are involved; but in other masc. *ṛ*-stem forms, §§ 13.9, 12, 13, and even in the case of *i* and *u*-stems, there are occasional occurrences of the regularly fem. oblique case-forms in masc. words.

13.34. The forms occur only in the prose of Mv, as follows. Inst.: *parityaktā pitare* i.311.3; parallels with *pitari* 310.17; 311.4, 7; *mātare kapilavastuṃ visarjitā* 354.9; *yathā tāye mātari saṃdiṣṭā* 354.20, repeated 355.2; *pitare punaḥ-punar uccati* ii.101.2; *pitare pi* (*mātare pi*, not in mss.) 103.4; *pitare kumāro . . . visarjitaḥ* 103.15; *mātare vuccati* 463.16 'was spoken to by her mother', and so also 464.14; 465.16 (so v.l.; text with 1 ms. *mātāye*); 467.5; 473.2; 474.17; 486.18; *pitare* (*preṣitāni*) 469.16; *mātare* iii.131.20 (*samāgacchatu*, 'let him join his mother'); *tāye mātare* 132.6; 155.9, 10, 12; (*tāye*) *ca mātare mṛgīye* 150.18; *mātare* 179.9; *pitare ca kālagatena* 184.9 (note the inst. modifier).

13.35. Dative or Loc.: *mātare āgatvā* 'coming to her mother' Mv i.310.18; so mss.; Senart em. *mātaraṃ*. Note that *pitare* and *pitari* occur in the same context, and are kept by Senart who regards them as locs.; *mātare* could surely be kept as a loc., as well as *pitare*; the loc. could be used of the goal of *āgatvā*; but *mātare* may also be intended as dative.

13.36. Gen.: (*eṣā*) *pitare ālokaṃ nisṛṣṭā* i.313.14, 'she is released unto the sight of her father'; *aham etaṃ pitari vacanaṃ . . . nivedayiṣyāmi* ii.437.12, 'I shall explain this our father's word'.

13.37. Gen. or Loc. (absolute): *tāye rājadhītare* (v.l. °*dhītāye*) . . . *gatāye* ii.65.17, 'when that princess had gone'. As loc. could pass for masc. *a*-stem form, § 13.17.

13.38. Inst. sg. -ṛṇā. This ending (admitted for neuter *ṛ*-stems in Skt.) occurs sporadically in prose and verse. It is, of course, analogical to the inst. of *i* and *u*-stems. *pitṛṇā* Mv i.309.10 (prose); Mmk 604.10 (vs); *bhrātṛṇā* Suv 215.6 (vs).

13.39. Gen. sg. -u. This ending, the regular MIndic resultant of the Skt. *-uḥ*, occurs here as in Pali (not in Pkt.); chiefly in verses, but in Mv in metrically indifferent situations and occasionally in prose (these cases are noted). *mātu* LV 133.12; 411.20; (but in 133.12 read *pituḥ*, as metr. required, with all mss. but one, for *pitu*); *pitu* 199.2 (with Corrigenda); *śāstu* 357.10. — *śāstu* Mv i.68.16, 73.1; ii.364.11; 371.4, 9; 373.5; iii.54.15, 16 (the last two prose); 305.6 (vs but not m.c.); *mātu* i.125.3, 4 (both vss, but metr. indifferent; mss. vary, Senart once *mātu*, once *mātuḥ*); ii.8.19 (prose); iii.132.7 (Senart prints as stem in comp., which is possible) and 8 (both prose); *jāmātu* iii.23.14 (prose); *pitu* (before vowel; v.l. *pitur*) 124.19 (vs, not m.c.).

13.40. Gen. sg. -aro. No such form seems to be recorded in MIndic; but cf. Pali inst. *mātarā*; both are doubtless formed by analogy to the loc. *mātari* (= *padi* : *padā* : *padaḥ, pado*); *mātaro stanaṃ* Mv ii.210.17 (prose; no v.l.) 'the mother's breast'.

13.41. Nom. pl. -āra, -ara. Only in verses m.c. for *-āraḥ, -araḥ*. Not recorded in Pali or Pkt. *śāstāra* SP 287.6; *pitara* LV 341.19.

13.42. Acc. pl. fem. -ṝn. A few times fem. *ṛ*-stems are recorded with the masc. acc. pl. ending. (All prose.) *tāṃ māraduhitṝn* LV 323.20 (so all mss., Calc. °*tā* °*tṝn*); *tāṃ svaduhitṝn* 330.6 (all mss., both edd.); and perhaps 320.1, where some mss. *duhitṝn*, others *duhitarī* (§ 13.18; Lefm. em. *duhitṝr*).

13.43. Acc. pl. -ṛn, -ṛṃ (?). Twice, at least, the mss. of Mv are reported as writing a short *ṛ* in the acc. pl. ending; Senart keeps the first, emends the second: *mātā-pitṛñ ca* (for Skt. °*pitṝṃś ca*) *deśenti* i.170.2 (vs); *pitṛṃ ubhau* 185.2 (mss.; vs; Senart em. *pitṝn*; meter requires long syllable, but this requirement is met by final anusvāra in our dialect).

13.44. Inst. pl. -ṛhi, -ṝhi. Parallel to *-ihi, īhi, -uhi, -ūhi* in *i* and *u*-stems, we find both *-ṛhi* and *-ṝhi*. The latter is certainly analogical to *-īhi, -ūhi*; its occurrence is independent of meter, which is nowhere concerned. All but one of the following are prose. *bhrātṛhi* Mv i.352.20; *pitṝhi* (v.l. *pitṛhi*) ii.86.15 (vs, but metr. indifferent); *mātāpitṛhi* 210.13 (v.l. °*pitṝhi*); iii.383.6; 394.7; *bhrātṝhi* 433.1.

13.45. Gen. pl. -ṛṇāṃ. Only occurs certainly in vss, where it may be m.c. for *-ṝṇām*: in SP 70.2 Kashgar rec. *duḥśrāddheyam idaṃ dharmaṃ deśitaṃ adya śāstṛṇāṃ*; but Tib. supports *vināyaka* of ed. instead of *śāstṛṇāṃ* (reading rnam ḥdren). — *bhrātṛṇāṃ* LV 387.6.—In prose: *bhrātṛṇāṃ* Mv ii.434.3, 8; v.l. °*tṝṇāṃ* in both.

13.46. Loc. pl. -ṝṣu. Only in vss, m.c. for *-ṛṣu*. *mātāpitṝṣu* Mv ii.220.18; 223.2 (v.l. °*ṛṣu*, but meter requires long penult).

14. Diphthongal stems

14.1. The stem *nāvā*, an *ā*-extension of Skt. *nau*, is familiar in Pali, AMg. and other Prakrits (Geiger 88.2; Pischel 394). It also occurs here: as stem in composition, *nāvā-yānena* Mv i.217.6; *nāvā-yānehi* ibid. and i.227.12, 15 (all prose); and acc. sg. *nāvām*, LV 216.5 (vs); Mv ii.59.7 (vs). The only record of this stem in Skt. is the RV. ἅπ. λεγ. *nāvayā* (instr.), on which see Ved. Var. 3 § 289, Wackernagel III p. 224; a better classification of it might be to call it a morphological Prakritism.

14.2. In Mv i.156.1 and 6 (vss) the meter requires a long syllable in the final of *divi*, which apparently all mss. read; probably *divī* is the true reading.

15. Consonant stems

15.1. 'Root' consonant stems, and those which do not belong to special types like the *s*, *n*, and *nt*-stems, show the same two types of MIndic treatment found in the latter. They are made into vocalic stems, either by loss of the final consonant, leaving the preceding vowel as stem-final; or by addition of *-a* (with fem. nouns usually *-ā*) to the final consonant. Such processes, particularly the latter, are familiar even in Skt.; cf. in general Wackernagel III.319 ff., and (in cpds.) II.1.61 ff. ('Stammverstümmelung' 64), 108 ff. On MIndic see Pischel 395 and Geiger 75, 89 with note 1. Pischel refers to thematically extended forms only for fems., as *sariā* = our *saritā*. He mentions the stems with loss of final consonant, like our *jaga-* for *jagat-*, which is common in Pkt. This stem seems not to occur in Pali, but for its type see Geiger ll.cc., also 66.2b where he mentions the 'new stem' *parisā* for Skt. *pariṣad*; he might have added *upanisā* = *upaniṣad*. Pali also has such stems as *vijju-* (beside *vijjutā-*) for *vidyut-*, *maru-* for *marut-*, *Pasenadi-* for *Prasenajit-*. Extended stems, in Pali as in Pkt., seem to be nearly limited to Skt. fems. The stem *tvac-* is fem. in Skt.; in Pali it is recorded as nt., either *taco* (based on nom.-acc. pl. *tvacas*?) or *taca-*. So also *sarada-* (apparently masc.; or nt.?) = *śarad*, presumably based on the nom.-acc. pl. *śaradaḥ*; *āpa-* = *āp-*, *ap-* 'water'. Examples of other Pali stems, keeping the fem. gender of Skt., are *nibbidā* = *nirvid*, *saṃpadā* = *saṃpad*, *vijjutā*, *samidhā*, *saritā*, *paṭisaṃbhidā* = *pratisaṃvid* (only BHS), *girā*. Some of these are cited as Skt. in the lexicons, but not in literature (except BHS).

Vocalic stems produced by loss of final consonants

15.2. a-stems. Almost the only *a*-stem of this sort noted is *jaga* (so also Pkt., above, but not Pali), for *jagat*. It is very common, but so far as my collections show, found only in verses; even Mv prose seems not to contain it, unless I have failed to record occurrences. Note that Kauṣ Up. 1.3 has *jagāni*, which Wackernagel III.263, 324 explains as analogical to *tat* : *tāni*; but no *tāni* or similar form occurs in the context, and it seems best to take it as merely a MIndic form. Examples (all in vss):

Stem *jaga* in composition: LV 158.8; 161.21; 162.3; 360.1; Mv ii.26.14; Laṅk 364.2.

jagaṃ, nom.-acc. sg., LV 215.20; Mv ii.25.8; 46.10, 12, 14; Bhad 21 (but Gv 544.23 *jagat*); Laṅk 313.14.

jaga, m.c., nom.-acc. sg., RP 7.12 (read as separate word).

jagu, m.c., nom.-acc. sg., LV 164.4; 167.8; Gv 253.7, 11.

jagasya, gen. sg., LV 116.19; 134.15 (but in 188.22 read *sarvajagato 'sya* with mss. for Lefm. *sarve jagasya*); Bhad 9, 11, 15, 18, 21, 30, 61.

jage, loc. sg., LV 45.10; 46.13; 50.8; 111.17; Suv 31.5; RP 3.4, 6; 6.4; Mmk 59.21; 376.9.

jagi, m.c. for prec., LV 41.18.

jagasmin, loc. sg., Gv 255.25.

jageṣu, loc. pl., RP 3.11.

15.3. Otherwise note *tirya* (Dict.), repeatedly for *tiryañc*, *tiryak*; and what seems to be a nt. sg. bahuvrīhi ending in *-saṃpa* for *-saṃpad*, in a vs (m.c.): *jñānasaṃpa jagatopajīvitaṃ* (so divide) *agrayānam* Gv 56.14, 'the supreme vehicle, characterized by a treasure-store of knowlege, upon which the whole world lives.'

15.4. Fem. nouns in which *a* precedes the Skt. final usually become *ā*-stems, as in Pali *parisā*, *upanisā* (prose passages marked):

pariṣā (= *pariṣad*), stem in comp., Mv i.133.16 (prose); *pariṣā*, nom. sg. Mv. i.158.3 (prose); ii.446.16, 17 (prose); *pariṣāṃ*, acc. sg. LV 361,10; 363,13; Mv i.171.12, 16; 354.21 (prose); *mahāpariṣā*, acc. sg. (mss.; Senart em. °*ṣāṃ*) Mv ii.419.1 (prose); *pariṣāyaḥ* (read °*yāḥ*), abl.-gen. sg., SP Kashgar rec., La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1074 (KN 267.10 *parṣadi* without v.l.); *pariṣāya*, oblique sg., SP 98.7; Mv i.310.6 (prose); *pariṣāye*, obl. sg., Mv iii.10.15 (prose); *pariṣāyāṃ* loc. sg. Mv i.75.3; 171.14 (in the same context 172.9 *pariṣadi*); *pariṣāhi* inst. pl. Mv iii.53.1 (prose).

parṣā (= *pariṣad*, *parṣad*): *parṣāye* obl. sg. Mv i.310.5 (prose); *parṣāś* nom. pl. SP 9.1; *parṣāṇāṃ* gen. pl. Mv i.27.11 (prose; one ms. *parṣadānāṃ*); *parṣāṇa* SP 237.13; *parṣāsu* loc. pl. SP 354.12.

upaniṣā: °*ṣāṃ*, acc. sg., SP 333.7 (prose; v.l. °*ṣadam*); RP 59.16 (prose); KP 159.17 (prose); in AsP 72.4; 98.11 (both prose) *upanisām apy upaniṣadam* (or °*sadam*) *api* (! as if the two were quite distinct words); spelled *upaniśām* Sukh 31.9 (prose); Dbh 66.26 (prose); Gv 542.3 (prose). Most texts have, either alone or by the side of this, the stem *upaniṣad*.

Once, at least, before the suffix *-vant(a)*, the prefinal Skt. *a* remains short even in one of these feminines: *parṣavantāna tāyinām* SP 303.13 (both edd., no v.l.). Tho found in a verse (anuṣṭubh), the short *a* cannot be m.c., for the second syllable could quite well be long.

15.5. i-stems: Stem in comp.: *dasadi-gatāṃ* LV 163.14 (vs), so read with most and best mss., Lefm. *daśadig-gatāṃ* (unmetrical); *abhiji-* (for *abhijit-*) Mv i.2.5 (prose).

Nom. sg. *-i*: *abhiji* Mv iii.236.14 (prose).

Voc. sg. *-i*: *abhiji* Mv i.2.3.

15.6. u-stems, only *vidyu* for *vidyut*, *maru* (usually 'god', = *deva*) for *marut*; both very common; *maru*, at least, is used in prose (unmarked examples are from vss):

Stem in composition: *vidyu-* LV 174.17; Mv i.146.8 = ii.7.5; ii.337.5; RP 45.5; *maru-* SP 12.13; LV 82.15 (prose); 80.19 (read *ca marusahasrair*); Mv i.71.21; 72.11; 90.18; ii.328.5; Av ii.176.12.

vidyur, nom. sg.: *vidyur iva* Mv ii.181.5 (so mss.; Senart em. *vidyud iva*). — *vidyu*, nom sg.: LV 173.14. — *vidyuṃ*, acc. sg.: Mv ii.397.15. — *marū*, nom. pl.: SP 208.9. — *maru*, nom. pl.: Mv ii.299.5. — *naramarū*, acc. pl.: Mv i.72.15 (Senart em.; mss. °*ru*; meter obscure). — *vidyubhiḥ*, inst. pl.: LV 214.7; *marubhi* Mv i.100.9; *maruhi* Mv iii.267.16 (here in its old meaning, the Maruts). — *marūṇāṃ*, gen. pl. LV 12.13; 370.14; Mv i.113.15; 143.16; 268.15; *maruṇāṃ* (m.c.) LV 129.19.

Consonant stems made into *a*-stems by addition of *-a*

15.7. Masculine and neuter stems. As we saw above, these are recorded for Pali and Pkt., at least in

Pischel and Geiger, only with Skt. feminines (in words of this general type). In our language, however, Skt. masculines and neuters may be treated in the same way. Thus:

vaṇija- (see Dict.), stem in comp., LV 385.13, 16 (vss); *vaṇijāḥ* nom. pl. id. 208.6 (prose); °*jānām* gen. pl. id. 387.10 (prose).

jagata- (for *jagat*, but far rarer than *jaga-*); *jagatasya* Mv i.120.3 (vs).

maruta-, stem in comp., LV 95.5 (vs); *marutaiś* inst. pl. SP 69.2 (vs); *marutāna* gen. pl. Samādh 19.21 (vs).

15.8. There is even, once, a stem *vaṇika-* (in comp.), which may be formed by addition of *-a* to the nom. sg. *vaṇik*: Mv i.1.8 (prose); see Dict. for another possibility. Senart i.367 interprets it as *vaṇi* (MIndic for *vaṇij*) with suffix *-ka*, but this seems implausible. He cites a parallel from SP, *bhiṣaka* from *bhiṣaj*; but (aside from the fact that this might be interpreted as I have suggested interpreting *vaṇika*) the reading of KN for the SP passage, 292.11 (vs), is *bhiṣaṭka* without v.l. (so also WT). See Wackernagel III.326 (§ 166b) for stray inflectional forms based on the nom. sg., which are not dissimilar.

15.9. Feminine stems of this type usually add *-ā* and retain fem. gender, as normally in Pali and Prakrit (§ 15.1). Examples: *par(i)ṣadā*: *pariṣadāyām* Suv 21.14 (vs), mss., Nobel em. *parṣa*°, m.c. (loc. sg.); *parṣadānām*, gen. pl. Mv i.29.13 (prose); *samidhā* (= *samidh*): *samidhā-hāraka* (stem in comp.) Divy 487.14 ff. (prose); *puṣpa-samidhānām* Divy 70.6 (prose), gen. pl. (so mss.; ed. em. °*samidhām*); *vidyutā* (cf. § 15.10): *vidyutām* LV 214.16, acc. sg.; *pratisaṃvidā* (cf. § 15.11): *dharmapratisaṃvidā* Bbh 89.25 (prose), etc. (nom. sg., four times); *prati-saṃvidānāṃ* SP 204.11 (vs), gen. pl.; °*dāsu* 205.12 (vs), loc. pl.; °*dāto* Śikṣ 109.6 (vs), abl. sg.; *nirvidā* (Pali *nibbidā*) = *nirvid*: *nirvidāye* Mv iii.331.4 (prose), dat. sg. (cf. LV 416.18 *nirvide*); *nirvidāya* KP 126.10, 15 (vss), dat. sg.; *girā* (only Lex. in Skt.) = *gir*: *girā*, LV 360.15 (vs), nom. sg.; *girām* SP 152.2 (vs); *girāṃ* Mv ii.143.23 (vs), acc. sg.; *-girāhi* Mv i.163.16 (vs), inst. pl.; *saritā*: *sa-nagara-nigama-saritā . . . vasumatī* Mv i.83.3 (vs), nom. sg.; *-saritālayam* (stem in comp.; 'home of rivers' = 'ocean') Mmk 66.9 (vs); *saṃpadā*: nom. sg. °*dā* SP 462.6 (vs); Mv ii.164.16; 208.15 (both prose); acc. sg. or pl. °*dā* Mv i.89.2 (vs; read with mss.); inst. sg. °*dāya* SP 46.5 (vs) *te āśaya-saṃpadāya viśuddharūpāya samanvitā 'bhūt*, 'they were endowed with a store of mental disposition pure in form' (wrongly Burnouf and Kern); inst. sg. °*dāye* Mv ii.293.8.

15.10. Sometimes, however, a stem ending in short *-a* is found in such words. In verses, where meter demands short *-a*, this may be merely a matter of metrical license: *vidyuta-prajña* LV 414.11 (vs); and possibly *tvaca-naddhāḥ* 324.11 (vs), which might represent *tvacā* (inst. of *tvac*) *naddhāḥ*; *sarada-ghana-samā* (= *śarad-gha*°, but see § 15.12) 328.1 (vs); in 287.10 (vs), read probably: *sa-pratisaṃvida-satya-balaṃ ca* (mss. very confused; *pratisaṃvida* might be m.c. for °*dā*).

15.11. But there are some cases where meter cannot explain the short *a*. Thus Mv iii.321.14–15 has four times the stem *-pratisaṃvida-* in prose: *artha-pratisaṃvida-prāptā* etc. Clearly the stem is here either masc. or nt.; nt. if we may trust Mv iii.67.2–3, also prose: *catvāri ca pratisaṃvidāni sākṣīkare* (same phrase repeated line 4).

15.12. So the stem *-tvaca-* appears in that form in composition in Mv iii.71.16 (prose); 75.3 (prose); 83.12 (vs); Divy 630.8 (prose). Note that Pali also has *taca-* (*taco*? § 15.1). Since Pali also has a stem *sarada* (§ 15.1), it may well be that LV 328.1 (§ 15.10) intends *śarada-*, not *śaradā-*.

15.13. Such a stem is *āpa* = *āp*, *ap* 'water' (also in Pali, Geiger 89 note 1). It occurs in acc. sg. *āpaṃ* Mv ii.92.5 (vs), and as stem in composition: *āpaskandham* (acc.) SP 126.7 (vs), 'mass of water'; *adha-āpaskandham* (to be treated as a single cpd.) LV 64.12 (prose), 'mass of water below' (i. e. under the earth, cf. the following); *heṣṭāpaskandha* (acc. sg.) *caraṇaiḥ pratigrāhyamāṇāḥ* LV 298.20 (so read; vs), 'being caused to receive, presented with, the mass of water below' (they were *vajra*-bodied, hard, impervious); *heṣṭi śatasahasraṃ yāvataś cāpaskandho* LV 368.19 (vs; contrasted with *dharaṇitala*, next line; all these passages clearly refer to subterranean waters).

15.14. There appears to be one anomalous case of addition of *i* to a consonantal stem, viz. *hṛdi*, in composition for *hṛd*, 'heart'; see Dict. s.v.[1]

Other, miscellaneous 'irregularities'

15.15. The nom. sg. (endingless) seems to be used as acc. sg., by analogy with the more or less constant assimilation of the forms of these two cases to each other: *bāhuṃ prasārya yatha vidyud ivā nabhasthā* LV 340.13 (vs), 'stretching out his arm like lightning, as it were, in the sky'. It can only be the arm that is compared to lightning. But perhaps nom., 'as lightning (is) set in the sky'(?).

15.16. Inst. sg. *-a*, m.c. for *-ā*: *vāca manena* Bhad 1, 8; *vāca manasā* LV 139.8.

Abl.-gen. sg. *-a*, m.c. for *-as*, *-o*: *kāyatu vāca manasya* Bhad 43.

Nom.-acc. pl. *-a*, m.c. for *-as*, *-o*: *vidiśo* (or, with v.l. on 16, *vidiśā*) *diśa* LV 177.4, 16 (vss; so read with most mss. on 16; ed. *diśi* both times); *diśa* Mv ii.321.11; 336.5 (vss), acc. pl.

Nom. pl. with elision of ending *-as*, *-o*, or fusion with following *ā-*: *marut' āgata* = *maruta(ḥ) āgatāḥ* LV 114.20 (vs).

? Nom. pl. endingless, = nom. sg.: *paripūrṇadvādaśa-sahasra marud viśuddha(ḥ)* LV 113.19 (vs). The form *marud* is either nom. pl., or part of an irregular compound (§ 23.10).

Acc. pl. used as nom. pl. (weak for strong stem form): *tiraśco* Śikṣ 80.1 (nom.; not *tiraścyo* as suggested in note).

---

1. Probably *giri* also occurs for *gir* 'voice, speech' as stem in composition: LV 393.3 (see Dict. s.v. *Giri*); RP 47.1 (vs) *giri-vara sahitārthā*, '(Buddha's) excellent speech has sensible meaning.'

16. S-stems

16.1. Most 'irregular' *as*-stem forms noted fall into two categories. Both involve transfer to the *a*-declension, in the one case by addition of *-a* to the stem in *as*, in the other by loss of *s*, or substitution of *-a* for *-as* as stem final. Both are familiar in Pali and Prakrit, and there as here the latter are much commoner than the former (Geiger 99; Pischel 409, 410). Even in Sanskrit such forms are familiar (Wackernagel II.1 pp. 96, 113; III p. 286). But there they occur mostly in compounds; and they can certainly be called essentially MIndic when they appear on the scale found in our texts, which show them extensively in uncompounded words also, and by no means only in verses.

Stem *-asa*

16.2. In composition: *vrata-tapasa-guṇena* LV 151.20 (vs).

16.3. Nom. sg. masc. -asas, -aso, etc.: LV (all vss): *kṛpakaruṇāmanaso* LV 167.22; *sudīnamanasaḥ* 194.5; *pramuditamanasaḥ* 287.14 (note, in same line, *āttamanāś ca*); *prasannamanaso* 315.10; *viraktamanaso* 330.15. — *prītamanaso* Mv i.224.12 = ii.27.12 (vs).

16.4. Nom. sg. fem. -asā: *apsarasā* (repeatedly) Kv 3.9 ff. (prose).

16.5. Voc. sg. masc. -asa: *hatatamasa* LV 169.20 (vs).

16.6. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -asaṃ: *kṛṣṇaśirasaṃ* LV 16.9 (prose); *ujjvalitatejasaṃ* 21.4 (prose); *vratatapasaṃ* 212.11 (vs). — *ātmacetasaṃ* Mv ii.232.5 (vs); *manasaṃ* (= *manas*, not in comp.) 447.6 (prose).

16.7. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -asa, in verse: *vratatapasa* LV 168.20 (vs), all mss.; Lefm. em. °*sā*; I am not certain that the meter (*rolā* or *lolā*) requires a long syllable in this position (5th syllable of the pāda); it is often short in this passage, to judge from Lefmann's mss.

16.8. Loc. sg. -ase: *vayase* LV 174.9 (vs); *virajase* 227.1 (prose).

16.9. Gen. pl. -asānām: *anantayaśasānām* Mv i.172.17 (vs).

Stem *-a* for *-as*

16.10. In composition, and before such suffixes as *vant*. Note that even a fem. stem like *apsaras* may be treated in the same way; see below. *yaśakāmanāmnā* SP 27.10 (vs; for *yaśask*°, which is used in the prose version but would be metrically impossible here); *ananyamanasaṃkalpo* 335.4 (vs). — *yasavatī* (or *yaśa*°) LV 50.4 (vs); *ura-gaṇḍa-* (cf. Skt. *ura-ga*) 72.2 (prose); *oja-vinduko*, *-vindu* etc. 73.22 ff. (vss); *mana-buddhi-* 177.9 (vs); *tamaraja-dhūmaketubhiḥ* 217.3 (vs); *tejavattamāś ca* (all mss.) 301.20 (prose); *apsara-koṭi*° 313.7 (vs).—Mv (all prose): *apsara-(sahasrehi, śata-)* Mv i.32.7; 145.1; *mana-karmeṇa* 128.3; *ekāgra-mana-saṃpannā* ii.292.15. — *varcāhāra* Av i.253.2; 254.2; 255.11 (all prose), for *varca(s)-āhāra*, 'feeding on dung' (in i.253.2, only, best ms. followed by text reads *varcohāra*, which is surely only a ms. blunder); also *varca-ghaṭa* i.252.1, 'pot of dung'; *varca-dhānāni* i.254.5 (vs) 'dung-heaps'. In the same context *varcaḥ-sadṛśīṃ* i.253.1, with 'regular' stem *varcas*. — Suv (all vss): *tama-cetasā* Suv 26.6; *manendriyaṃ* 56.12; *śirajo* 244.10, 'hair'. — *apsaravargāś ca* Laṅk 6.5 (vs; one ms. *apsaro*°, metrically inferior).

16.11. Note on *apsara(s)*. Several times above this stem appears as *apsara-*, even in Mv prose. Below we shall see that inflected forms with *neuter* endings (*apsarāṇi*, *apsaraiḥ*, §§ 16.24, 26) are recorded. It is clear that the stem was capable of inflection as a neuter *a*-stem, just as neuter *s*-stems are. No such forms seem to be recorded for MIndic, so far as I know.

16.12. Nom. sg. masc. -as, -o etc. *ugratejo* LV 39.13 (prose); *samatītavayo* (v.l. °*yā*) 174.17 (vs); *anantatejo* 240.9 (before *s-*); *virajaḥ* 288.2; 393.1 (vss); *mūḍhamano* 323.12 (vs).—In 442.1–2 (prose), text *avahitaḥ śrotaḥ*, Weller (39) em. *avahita-śrotaḥ*, which must be right in sense; but the (best) ms. A has *-śrotraḥ*, so that it is not certain that an original *s*-stem (*śrotas*) is concerned (rather than *śrotra*). — *mahāyaśo* Mv i.67.9 (vs); *atitejaḥ* (mss. *abhi*°) 122.6 (vs); *durmano* 42.3 = 230.10 (prose; in 240.20, same phrase, *durmanā*); *gatavayo* ii.41.2 (vs).

16.13. Nom. sg. fem. -ā: *āttamanā* Mv i.213.13 = ii.16.16 (prose). Cf. *śreyā*, § 16.35.

16.14. Acc. sg. masc. -aṃ: *anantayaśaṃ* LV 45.10 (vs).

16.15. Acc. sg. fem. -ām: *bodhi virajām* (before vowel) LV 337.3 (vs).

16.16. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -aṃ, -am: *rajaṃ* SP 157.12 (vs); *paramāṇurajaṃ* 316.7 (prose) and (Kashgar rec.) 316.8 (prose; ed. with Nep. mss. °*jaḥ*). — *śiraṃ* LV 56.9 (vs); *rajam* 114.11 (vs); *puṇyateja śiram* (nom.) *ūrdhvavilokitaṃ ca* 116.6 (vs; so probably read) 'his head has glory of merit and an upward gaze'; *śiram api* 165.11; *vratatapam* (before *ā-*) 211.13; 244.1 (both prose); *vacaṃ* 336.5 (vs); *śrotam* (v.l. °*tram*) 409.10 (prose). — *manaṃ* Mv i.146.13 = 203.14 (vs; in ii.7.10, same vs, *manaḥ*); *manaṃ* in prose ii.151.15; 157.13; iii.379.10; *tejaṃ* i.215.9 = ii.18.6; *nabhaṃ* i.222.20 (here mss. *nabhe*) = ii.25.6; *ojaṃ* (*haranti*; subject *ojo-hārakā*) i.253.3 (prose); *padma-saraṃ* (= °*saras*) ii.97.12 (prose); *uraṃ* 154.9 (prose); *tapaṃ* 232.6 (vs); *śiram anu* 282.6 (prose; so divide, 'along his head'); *śiraṃ* 412.5 (prose); *vayam* (= *vayas*) *anuprāpto* iii.206.18 (prose); *vacaṃ* 370.11 (vs).

16.17. Inst. sg. -ena: *ojena* SP 175.4 (vs). — *tejena* LV 122.21; 132.8, 14 (in 14 read *tejena* with most mss. for ed. *tejo nu*); 157.22; 385.15 (all vss). — *manena* Mv i.161.10; 176.11 (vss); *tejena* 210.14 = ii.14.13; ii.219.2 (all prose); *yaśena* ii.35.2 (vs); *tapena* 231.16 (vs). — *pāda-rajena* Divy 606.28 (vs). — *yaśena* Suv 37.2; 42.2 (vss); *manena* 49.22 (vs). — *manena* Bhad 1, 2, 8 (vss).

16.18. Abl. sg. -āto, and m.c. -ato, -ātu, -atu: *tamāto* Mv i.27.8; ii.215.10 (both prose; so Senart, rightly; mss. *namāto* in i.27.8, and corrupt in ii.215.10); *nabhato* ii.18.14 (vs). — *nabhātu* LV 194.11 (vs); *tejatu* 275.17 (vs).

16.19. Gen. sg. -asya: *aparimitayaśasya* Mv ii.219.18 (vs); *manasya* Bhad 43; *nabhasya* Bhad 46.

16.20. Loc. sg. -e: *nabhe va* (so divide) LV 49.21 (vs); *śire* (read the next word with v.l. *abhivandate*) 135.12 (vs); *śire* 190.15 (vs). — *ure* Mv i.130.15 (vs); *nabhe* 167.2; 186.11; 216.11 = ii.19.8; i.222.4, 6 = ii.24.12, 14 (all vss); *rahe* i.274.12 (vs); *śire* ii.282.12 (prose). — *nabhe* RP 7.3 (vs).

16.21. Loc. sg. -asmi (m.c. for *-asmiṃ*): *tapasmi* LV 331.2 (vs).

16.22. Inst. dual -ābhyāṃ: *-śrotābhyāṃ* LV 257.8 ff. (prose), several times, stem Skt. *srotas* (root *sru*). Note that in line 11 the best mss. read *-śrotrobhi*, which probably intends *-srotobhir* (inst. pl.); ed. *-śrotābhyo*, implausibly.

16.23. Nom. pl. masc. and fem. -ās: (also *-ā*, in defiance of Skt. saṃdhi): *tuṣṭamanāḥ* SP 87.10 (vs); *tuṣṭāttamanāś ca* 89.10 (vs; so read with WT for KN *tuṣṭānta°*). — *muditamanāḥ* LV 163.12 (vs); *sumanāḥ* 283.7 (vs); *ekaśirā dviśirā triśirāś ca yāvat sahasraśirā* (before *b-*) 307.20 (vs); *durmanās* 397.21 (prose). — *mahāyaśāḥ* Mv i.101.9 (several mss. *°yaśā*; vs, end of line); *mahātejāś ca* 103.7 (prose). — *āttamanās* Divy 66.24 (all mss.; prose; ed. em. *°manasas*). — *muktamanā* (before *v-*) Samādh 19.34 (vs).

16.24. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -āni, m.c. -ānī: *rajastarāṇī* LV 372.9 (vs) (for *°tarāṃsi*, stem *taras*, 'impetuosity', or 'current'); *apsarāṇi* 223.8 (vs; so read, as nom. pl., with nearly all mss.; Lefm. *apsarāṇāṃ*, which I cannot interpret); *cāpsarāṇī* (v.l. *°ṇi*; all mss. one or the other) 233.19. On *apsara*, quasi-neuter stem, for *apsaras*, see §§ 16.11, 26. — *nistejāni* (for *°jāṃsi*) Mv i.41.12 = 230.7 = 240.17 (prose).

16.25. Acc. pl. -a, m.c. for -ā = *-āni*: *vratatapa vividhā* LV 287.22 (vs).

16.26. Inst. pl. -ais: *jinatejair* LV 164.17; 167.11 (vss); *apsarai(ḥ)* 237.8 (vs). — *dharaṇī-rajair* Suv 36.6 (vs). — *apsaraiḥ*, *°air* Laṅk 4.9; 7.1 (vss; in 7.1 one ms. *apsaro-hāsyalāsyādyaiḥ*, as cpd.; this is clearly a Sanskritizing 'correction').

16.27. Gen. pl. -ānāṃ: *apsarāṇāṃ* LV 49.5, 11 (vss); *dhutarajānāṃ* Mv i.113.2; 119.4 (vss; Senart em. *dhūta°*).

16.28. Loc. pl. -eṣu: *sroteṣu* (v.l. *srotaḥsu*) Suv 15.1 (vs).

Miscellaneous non-Skt. forms of *as*-stems

16.29. Masc. *as*-stems, as in Pali and Pkt., may end in the nom. sg. in *-ā* even before voiceless consonants or pause: LV (all vss): *-upaśāntamanā* LV 46.4; *mahāyasā* 59.4 (for *°śāḥ*, which some mss. read); *-vismitamanā* 109.13; *dīptatejā* 220.4, most mss. (Lefm. with ms. A *°jaḥ*, as if *a*-stem); *durmanā* 221.18. — *āttamanā* Divy 440.24 (prose).

16.30. Apparently in analogy to this form, we even find, according to the printed text, in Gv 528.19 (prose) an acc. sg. in *-ām*, and that too where a neuter should be found: *mā parīttamanām utpādaya*, 'produce no limited mind', i. e. 'don't become fainthearted'. Cf. *sumanas* 'flower', fem., which has a stem *sumanā-(mukha)-*.

16.31. In verses, the nom. sg. (and acc. sg. nt.) of *as*-stems of all genders may end in *-a*, presumably m.c. Thus, masc.: *puṇyateja* LV 45.2; *ugrateja* LV 173.6. Fem.: *puṇyateja* LV 54.7. Nt.: *na ca mana* (all mss.; Lefm. em. *manu*) *kṣubhito* LV 165.16 (cf. § 8.36); *nadisrota* 175.8; *teja* 340.17; *ura* (acc.) 341.13. Prose cases are rare: *mana* (mss.) Mv ii.157.3.

16.32. Or, instead of *-a*, *-u* may appear, also in verses m.c.: *payu* LV 166.2; *raju* 338.7.

16.33. As in other declensions, *-hi* may replace *-bhis* of the inst. pl.: *apsarohi* Mv ii.192.18 (vs).

Comparative stems in *yas*

16.34. These are treated exactly like ordinary *as*-stems. They may be made into *a*-stems by addition of *-a* to the weak stem in *-yas*, or (more often) by dropping the final *s* of that stem. Of the former we find the voc. sg. masc. *pāpīyasa* Divy 202.5 (prose); and acc. sg. masc. *kanīyasaṃ* (*bhrātaraṃ*) Mv ii.82.9 (prose); *pāpīyasaṃ* LV 315.2; 318.2 (both prose). More usual, in the mss. and edd., is *pāpīyāṃsaṃ*, e. g. LV 314.22 (prose; to be sure with v.l. *°yasaṃ*).

16.35. Of the other type may be noted: stem in composition, and before suffix *-tara*: *śreyatara-* (see Dict. s.v.) Mv ii.54.6, 10 (vss); *niḥśreyasaṃpannā* Mv ii.292.3 (prose).—Nom. sg. fem., *śreyā* Mv ii.54.8, 18 (vss).—Nom. sg. nt., *niḥśreyaṃ* (*gṛhaṃ*) Mv ii.101.8 (prose).—Inst. sg. *kanīyena* Śikṣ 125.1 (prose; from Dharmasaṃgītisūtra).

Stems in *-is*

16.36. Stems in *-is* resemble those in *-as* in that they may become either *a*-stems by adding *a* to the stem in *s* (yielding stem-final *-iṣa*), or vocalic (in this case *i*) stems by the loss of the *s*. (So also sometimes in Skt., Wackernagel III.290 ff.). Examples of the first process, which here as in the *as*-stems is less common, are *jyotiṣā* LV 123.1 (vs) and *jyotiṣāṇī* (m.c. for *°ṇi*) LV 195.13 (vs), both nom.-acc. pl. nt., for *jyotīṃṣi*. (In the latter read with all mss. and Calc. *jyotiṣāṇī patantaḥ*, for Lefm.'s em. *jyotiṣā nīpatantaḥ*.)

16.37. The other type is shown by frequent use of *-i* instead of *-is* (*-ir*, *-iḥ*) as stem-final in cpds., and also by inflected forms from *i*-stems. Both are found in a prose phrase occurring as *jyotiarthiko jyotigaveṣī jyotiṃ* (acc. sg.) *paryeṣamāṇo* Mv ii.121.8; repetitions 122.3 and 18 read *jyotyartho* and *°arthiko*, and *jyoti* instead of *jyotiṃ*. The same phrase occurs in LV 246.17 in the form *agnyarthī jyotirgaveṣī* (one ms., not usually considered a good one, *jyoti-ga°*) *jyotiṃ* (only the same single ms. *jyoti*) *paryeṣamāṇaḥ*; and the last two words (only) are repeated (with *paryeṣata iti*) 247.7 where most mss. read *jyoti* instead of *jyotiṃ*.

16.38. Other cases of stem in *-i* in composition, and before suffix *vant*: *sarpir* (note this!) *yatha sarpimaṇḍe* LV 159.16 (vs); *arcivat* (to *arcis*) 176.1 (vs); *sarpi-hutārciteja-sadṛśā* 329.16 (vs); *sarpimaṇḍaṃ* 386.5 (prose); *sarpidohanaṃ* 386.18 (vs).

16.39. Other inflected forms of such stems: in LV 353.8 (vs), read: *tulyaḥ samo 'si yatha sarpiṇa sarpimaṇḍaiḥ*, 'thou art equal and similar (to us), as ghee to the scum of ghee' (cf. 159.16, cited above; Lefm. *sarpiṇi*, but nearly all mss. *sarpiṇa*, which stands m.c. for *sarpiṇaṃ*, nom. sg. nt. as of an *i(n)*-stem, see § 10.3). — *arciyo* Mv i.25.14 ff. (prose), nom. pl. fem. (§ 10.168); *jyotisya* ii.121.10; 123.2 (both prose), gen. sg. (§§ 10.78 f.).

Stems in *-us*

16.40. Aside from commonplace metrical variations like *divyācakṣuṣa* LV 108.16 (vs; for *divya-cakṣuṣā*; Lefm. prints as two words), the 'irregular' forms of *us*-stems fall into the same two broad groups as the *is*-stems, but are much commoner than they. That is, they may be made *a*-stems by addition of *-a*, or *u*-stems by loss of *-s*. (So occasionally in Skt., Wackernagel III.290–292.)

16.41. Stems in -uṣa are not common, and seem to be found only in compounds (cf. Mbh. Crit. ed. 1.169.24b *sacakṣuṣam*, and the like in Skt.; Wackernagel II.1.114 *-āyuṣa*): LV (all vss): *rūpaṃ vaiśravaṇātirekavapuṣaṃ* 130.13 (nom. sg. nt.); *amitāyuṣaś* 199.18 (nom. sg. masc.); *acakṣuṣāṇāṃ* 224.5 (gen. pl.). — *teṣām acakṣuṣāṇāṃ* Mv ii.223.5 (vs; mss. *°ṣonām*); *māṃsacakṣuṣaṃ* iii.177.8 (nom. sg. nt.; prose), so with v.l. for text *°cakṣuṃ*.

16.42. Stems in -u from original *us*-stems are very common. They participate generally in all the peculiarities shown by *u*-stems in this dialect. In so far as such forms are not recognized in the declension of Skt. *u*-stems, it has seemed most practical to list them along with the corresponding *u*-stem forms, above. We refer to our chapter on *u*-stems for the following forms: *-cakṣū* nom.

sg. masc., § 12.14; *āyuṃ*, *cakṣuṃ*, nom.-acc. sg. nt., § 12.29; *-cakṣuṣya*, *-āyuṣya*, °*sya*, gen. sg., § 12.35; *-cakṣuye*, oblique fem., § 12.42; *-cakṣu*, nom. pl. masc., and nom.-acc. pl. nt., § 12.61; *cakṣūhi*, °*uhi*, inst. pl., §§ 12.65,67.

16.43. This list will be completed by listing here forms of *us*-stems which in Skt. would be regular derivatives of *u*-stems. Stem *-u* in composition, and before suffixes (*-mant*, *-ka*): *cakṣumān* SP 192.1 (vs). — *divyacakṣu-prādurbhūtena* LV 84.7 (prose). — *cakṣumāṃ* (= *cakṣuṣmān*) Mv i.122.13; ii.143.4; 166.3 (all vss); *pañcacakṣu-samanvāgatā* i.158.1 (prose); *divyacakṣu-darśana-* 228.12 (prose); *bhavacakṣukaiḥ* 337.4 (prose).

16.44. Voc. sg. masc. -o: *viśuddhacakṣo* LV 370.20 (vs).

16.45. Acc. sg. masc. -uṃ: *hatatejavapuṃ* LV 174.10 (vs); *kanakavapuṃ* Mv i.210.2 = ii.14.1 (vs).

16.46. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -u: *māṃsacakṣu* SP 355.8 (vs), *divyacakṣu* 9; *āyu* 68.9; 218.1 (both vss).—LV (all vss): *āyu* 79.17; *cakṣu* 235.13; 421.10, 12. — *mānsacakṣu* Mv i.158.10; *prajñācakṣu* 337.4 (both prose and v.l. °*ṣur*).

16.47. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -ūni: *cakṣūṇi* Mv i.3.14; 158.3, 5 (all prose; mss. largely °*uṇi*).

16.48. Gen. pl.: *viśuddhacakṣūṇāṃ* Mv i.167.15 (vs; mss. °*cakṣuṇāṃ*, unmetrical).

Stems in *-vāṃs*, *-uṣ*

16.49. The stem Skt. *vidvāṃs*, *vidvat*, *viduṣ*, most commonly appears as *vidu*, on which see Dict., and *u*-stems, above. This seems to me clearly based on the weak stem *viduṣ-*, precisely as *āyu*, *cakṣu* etc. The same MIndic stem appears as Pali *vidu*, Pkt. *viu*; I do not believe it is a Vedic inheritance (Pischel 411 note 1 and Ved. St. 2.236), tho the Vedic form cited by Pischel may indeed be an early morphological Prakritism.

16.50. Again as with *cakṣuṣ-a* and the like, *viduṣa-ka* occurs in the same sense: Mv i.134.11 (prose).

16.51. The preconsonantal weak stem *vidvat* appears Prakritically as *vidva*, as stem in composition, *vidvamadena* LV 366.22 (vs) 'with pride of learning', which might be described as m.c. for *vidvan-madena*, but for the fact that the same line contains *avidvāṃ* (= °*vān*), clearly as acc. pl. masc. of a stem *avidva*: *na ca bhava atimanyase avidvāṃ*, 'and you, Sir, do not disdain the ignorant.'

16.52. Further, the form *viduṣas* (or m.c. *viduṣa*), the Skt. acc. pl., is used as nom. pl.: *-viduṣaś ca bhavanti* Mv i.133.16 (prose); *pravacana-viduṣo* Mv i.176.7 (prose); *prajñaviduṣa* LV 242.12 (vs; m.c. for °*ṣas*).

17. N-stems

17.1. The vast majority of non-Skt. forms of *n*-stems are adaptations to the *a*-declension.[1] They are made in three ways. (1) The pre-consonantal weak stem in *-a*, used even in Skt. regularly as composition stem form, is inflected like any *a*-stem. (2) To the pre-vocalic weak stem in *-n* or *-an* is added stem-final *-a*, and this stem in *-na* or *-ana* is thus inflected. (3) The same is done with the strong stem in *-ān*, producing a stem *-āna*. All three types are found in Pali (Geiger 92.2) and to some extent in Pkt. (notably for the resultants of *ātman*, Pischel 401; see also the adjoining §§). In our language, the first type is much commoner than the other two. After listing forms of these three types we shall mention first a few forms showing MIndic epenthesis of *a* or *i* before *n* in weak-grade forms, and then conclude with others, more heterogeneous in nature.

Weak stem in *-a*, declined as *a*-stem

17.2. This is the normal form of stem used as prior member of compounds in Skt.; it is also extensively used in Skt. as final member of compounds, under conditions set forth by Wackernagel. Pischel 400, however, notes that Prakrit often reverses its general tendency by using an *n*-stem at the end of cpds. where Skt. would substitute an *a*-stem. The same may be said of our language; e. g. *ye śrāvaka dharmarājñaḥ* SP 146.9 (vs), 'the disciples of the King of Dharma'; misinterpreted by Kern and Burnouf as nom. pl.; cf. *asya* (= *tathāgatasya*) *śrāvakā(ḥ)* 148.13 (prose); the Skt. would be *dharmarājasya*, Wack. II.1 p. 121, § 52d.

17.3. We find very many *a*-stem forms of this type from *n*-stems, not only with the regular Skt. *a*-stem endings, but with various other endings which *a*-stems may take in our language. A few examples follow; they could be multiplied many times. In the majority of texts only or chiefly in verses; prose passages are marked.

17.4. Nom. sg. masc. -aḥ, -o etc.: *mūrdho* LV 276.7 (so read; best mss. *mūrdhaḥ*; other mss. and Calc. *mūrdhni*, *mūrdhiṃ*; Lefm. em. *mūrdhnaṃ*; the stem *mūrdhan* is masc. in Skt. tho it may have nt. endings in BHS); *rāja idaṃ* Suv 149.8 (can be understood as representing *rājaḥ* by normal saṃdhi).

17.5. Nom. sg. masc. -u, only m.c. for preceding: *rāju* LV 76.3; 326.19 (v.l. *rāja*); 327.2.

17.6. Nom. sg. masc. -a, also only m.c.; but it is open to question whether it represents *-ā* or *-aḥ* (*-as*, *-o* etc.); whereas the preceding *-u* surely implies an *a*-stem: *rāja* LV 43.11; 170.15; 241.7; *brahma* 81.11; 92.9; 118.22; 240.22; *ātma* 393.10. — *rāja* Suv 150.6. — *brahma* RP 6.16; *ātma* 10.16; 12.11.

17.7. Voc. sg. masc. -a: *rāja* Mv i.128.19; 129.7; iii.457.3 (all vss, but metr. indifferent as to final); *viśvakarma* Divy 59.14 (prose; so mss.; ed. em. °*man*).

17.8. Acc. sg. masc. -aṃ: *mahātmaṃ* LV 47.9; 57.18; *mūrdhaṃ* 357.10 (end of line). — *brahmaṃ* Mv i.245.9 (prose).

17.9. Acc. sg. masc. -a: *avaciṣu rāja* LV 240.21 (vs), 'said to the king'.

17.10. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -aṃ (-am): *nāmaṃ* SP 27.10; *sthāmaṃ* 53.16; 380.2–3 (prose); *karmaṃ* 114.11. — *premaṃ* LV 41.20; 410.1 (prose); *sthāmaṃ* 153.3 (prose); 234.7 etc.; *veśmaṃ* 231.3; *romaṃ* 311.9; *bhasmaṃ* 312.20 (end of line); 315.22 (twice, once at end of line). — *karmam a-* Mv i.104.17; *karmaṃ* 169.6 (in same line *karma*; meter indifferent both times); *nāmaṃ* 227.4; 303.7; ii.210.11; iii.144.17 (all prose), etc.; *veśmaṃ* ii.28.14. — *-carmaṃ* Av i.265.4 (end of pāda, not m.c.). — *-karmaṃ* Suv 12.8 (v.l. *karma*; prose). — *nāmam a-* Kv 47.2; *carmam u-* 69.16 (both prose). — *nāmaṃ* Sukh 46.6.

17.11. Inst. sg. -ena: *nāmena* SP 23.10; 217.10; 222.3; 383.11; *karmeṇa* 166.9; 175.7; 353.5; *mūrdhena* 336.7; 343.12. — *nāmena* LV 28.8; *premeṇa* 232.6. — *nāmena* Mv i.51.7 (prose); 112.1; 114.12 etc.; *-karmeṇa* (repeatedly) 128.2ff. (prose): *śleṣmeṇa* 213.9 = ii.16.13 (prose); *mūrdhena* ii.26.6, 7 (prose); *sthāmena* 74.12 (prose); *premena* (dental *n*) 100.2, 3; 111.18 (all prose); *carmeṇa* 213.9, etc. — *tejena* Suv 149.2. — *nāmena* Mmk 104.17.

17.12. Inst. sg. -inā: *mūrdhinā* Mv i.65.14, m.c. for *mūrdhena*, § 8.40. Senart considers the *i* epenthetic, MIndic for *mūrdhnā*. But this stem seems not to show epenthetic *i* in MIndic as in Pali *rājinā*, Pkt. *rāiṇā*; in Pali, at least, epenthetic *i* in *n*-stems seems to occur only in forms of Skt. *rājñ-*, and this seems to be true of our language, § 17.50. (In Mv i.67.11 *mūrdhinā* is Senart's em. for *mūrdhanā*.)

17.13. Abl. sg. -a, m.c. for *-āt*, or 'stem-form', cf. § 8.9: *anyatra karma sukṛtād* LV 37.7, 'except deed(s) well done'. No v.l.; meter correct as it stands; no other construction seems possible.

17.14. Gen. sg. -asya: *karmasya* SP 325.8; LV 36.17; Mv i.16.8 (prose); iii.26.18 (prose). — *-nāmasya* Mv i.54.5 (prose); *carmasya* ii.222.12; *rājasya* (not in cpd.) Suv 148.13.

17.15. Loc. sg. -e: *adhve* SP 53.5; 61.13; 205.1 etc. — *-janme* LV 27.20; *brahme* 393.14. — *karme* Mv ii.463.2 (prose); *veśme* Mv iii.105.2; — *ātme* RP 19.6. — *śīrṣe* KP 132.3 (contrast 132.1, prose, *śirasi*).

17.16. Loc. sg. -i, m.c. for preceding: *-janmi* Gv 487.12.

17.17. Nom. pl. masc. -ās, -ā: *mahātmā* LV 29.11 (before *s-*); *romāḥ* 310.1 (so both edd., no v.l.; *roman* nt. in Skt., and acc. to Childers and PTSD in Pali); *-manokarmāś ca* (masc. Bhvr.) Mv i.134.6 (prose).

17.18. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -ā: *mārakarmā* LV 12.10; *karmā* Mv i.12.13; *nāmā* Mv ii.433.15, 18 (*kuśamiśrāṇi nāmā kṛtāni*; both prose; in 18 v.l. *nāmāni*).

17.19. Inst. pl. -ehi: *karmehi* Mv i.109.16.

17.20. Gen. pl. -ānāṃ: In SP 273.1, ed. *rājeṣu*, Kashgar rec. (La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1911, p. 1076) *rājānāṃ*. — *karmāṇāṃ* Mv i.16.13; 26.9, 13 (all prose); 178.12; 188.6; *rājānāṃ* ii.169.13; 247.19. — *karmāṇāṃ* Suv 141.17 (vs, not m.c.).

---

1. Cf. Wackernagel II.1 pp. 115–121; III.265, 321; but our forms are obviously MIndic in character and show no relation to the Sanskrit data except in so far as these reflect MIndic conditions, cf. the last reference.

17.21. Loc. pl. -eṣu: *rājeṣu* SP 273.1 (so ed., see preceding); *brahmeṣu* 129.6. — *karmeṣu* Mv i.134.12 (prose); Mmk 11.27; 29.21 etc. (prose). — *adhveṣu* Gv 28.23, etc.

Prevocalic weak stem extended by *-a*

17.22. Type of stem *mūrdhna, ātmana*. The *a* before *n* is found in *ātmana, parikarmaṇa, carmaṇa, parvaṇa*. Tho much less common than the preceding type, it is well authenticated in prose as well as verse.

17.23. Stem form in composition: *mūrdhnābharaṇā-* LV 432.16 (prose), 'ornaments for the head'; so all mss.; both edd. *mūrdhā°*; *carmaṇārthāya* Mv ii.213.7 (prose), 'for the sake of the hide'; the cpd. *mūrdhnābhiṣikta*, 'besprinkled (as king) on the head', is common in Divy prose, e. g. 557.19, and in Av, see Speyer's note on i.69.8 (where it occurs); *mūrdhna-prāptāḥ* RP 15.5; but Finot treats *mūrdhna* as a separate word, which is also possible (for *mūrdhnaṃ*, m.c.; § 17.27); *ātmana-hetur* RP 31.3.

17.24. Nom. sg. masc. -nas: *mahārājñaḥ* Mmk 24.13 (prose).

17.25. Nom. sg. masc. -(a)na, m.c. for preceding: *so tīrṇa-ātmana* (read as one cpd. word; v.l. *°ātmanaḥ*, unmetrical) *parān api tārayeyā* LV 300.17 'may he, himself rescued, rescue others also'.

17.26. Acc. sg. masc. -anaṃ, -anam: *ātmanaṃ*: *nagnā dṛśī ātmanaṃ* LV 194.13, 'she saw herself naked'; LV 298.8 (before *u-*); Mv iii.25.2 (prose; so mss.; Senart em. *ātmānaṃ*); Suv 62.2, read *ātmanaṃ*, mss. mostly *ātmanā* (unconstruable); Nobel *ātmānam* (metrically impossible).

17.27. Acc. sg. masc. -anu or -ana, m.c. for preceding: *ātmanu* LV 341.12 (so Lefm. with ms. A; most mss. *ātmana*); LV 420.16 (so Lefm.; v.l. *ātmana*).

17.28. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -(a)naṃ, -(a)nam: *mūrdhnaṃ* LV 316.11 (nom.); tho regularly masc. in Skt. (and apparently in Pali), *mūrdhan* also has nt. forms in our language; Mv ii.109.1 (prose; v.l. *mūrdhnim*; before vowel; Senart em. *°nel*; acc.); *premnaṃ* 168.14 (prose), 17, 19 (vss); 169.4 (prose); 300.12 (vs); iii.148.7, 13 and 375.15 (all prose); *parvaṇam* (nom.; see Speyer's note) Av i.302.6 (prose); *parikarmaṇaṃ* (= *°rma*) KP 92.8 (vs).

17.29. Inst. sg. -(a)nena: *mūrdhnena* SP 93.2; Mv ii.113.10, 11 (prose); *premnena* (dental *n*) Mv i.349.11 (prose); ii.171.19 (prose); 221.4 (vs); 460.9 (prose); *atipremnena* Mv ii.73.10 (prose); *ātmanena* Mv ii.329.18. Cf. iii.375.15 (prose) *premnakena* (Dict. s.v.).

17.30. Abl. sg. -nātu, m.c. for *-nātas*: *mūrdhnātu* LV 340.12.

17.31. Gen. sg. -(a)nasya: *mahārājñasya* Mmk 24.18 (prose); *ātmanasya* Suv 61.13.

17.32. Loc. sg. -ne: *mūrdhne* Mv ii.32.4 (prose; v.l. *mūrdhnane*; Senart em. *mūrdhani*); 109.2 (prose; v.l. *°ni*); 335.21; 359.20.

17.33. Nom. pl. masc. -nās: *garuḍa-rājñās* Mmk 18.26 (prose).

17.34. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -nāni: *-mūrdhnāni* Mv ii.307.5.

17.35. Inst. pl. -nais: *vidyā-rājñaiḥ* Mmk 10.6 (prose).

17.36. Loc. pl. -neṣu: *-mūrdhneṣu* SP 405.5 (prose; both edd., no v.l.).

Strong stem extended by *-a*

17.37. Type of stem *-āna*; starting doubtless from acc. sg. masc. where *ātmān-am* can be analyzed *ātmāna-m*. Like the preceding, less common than the first type, but well authenticated in prose and verse. See Wackernagel III p. 321, who correctly ascribes to MIndic influence some similar forms in late Skt., notably *śvāna* (which also occurs in our dialect). The form *adhvāna-(karṣita-)* Mbh. Calc. 3.13397 (for which Bomb. *adhvani*) occurs in a spurious chapter, evidently an extremely late one, for it is not mentioned even in the Appendix to Sukthankar's ed.; apparently, therefore, it is not found in *any* of Sukthankar's mss.

17.38. Stem in composition. In the first six examples from Mv, Senart prints *rājāna* as a separate word (understanding a gen. pl., doubtless). But there is no doubt whatever that it is a stem-form, compounded with the following. Senart recognizes this in the precisely similar cases from ii.410.11 on. Mv (all prose): *koṭṭarājāna-sahasrehi* i.234.16; *rājāna-sahasrāṇi* 271.15; *rājāna-śatāni* ii.98.8; *rājāna-śatehi* 98.10; *rājāna-śatānāṃ* 141.1; 158.1; *śvāna-mukhā* 410.11; *rājāna-sahasra-* iii.176.3; *adhvāna-kilānto* 350.10. — *adhvāna-mārga* (Pali *addhāna-magga*) Suv 72.11 (prose); Prāt 510.4 (prose). — *bhikṣurājāna-kṣobhaṇe* Śikṣ 45.9. — *śvāna-tulya* KP 107.30 'dog-like'.

17.39. Nom. sg. masc. (-ānas,) -āno: *ātmāno 'vatīrya . . . ahaṃ tārayiṣye* etc. LV 216.5, 'descending myself (into the flood of the saṃsāra) I shall rescue' etc. (However, the meter seems to demand a short syllable for *-o* and a long for *'va-*!) More normal Skt. usage would seem to suggest *svayam*; but the nom. *ātmā* is used in ways which at least come close to this. — *śvāno* KP 107.7. *-takṣāṇo* (see Dict.).

17.40. Nom. sg. masc. -ānu, m.c. for preceding; *na ca yatra svānu* (v.l. *ścānu*, intending *śvānu*) *bhavati*, 'and not where a dog is' LV 258.7.

17.41. Gen. sg. -ānasya: *rājānasya* Mv iii.158.2 (prose, no v.l.); *takṣāṇasya* (Dict.).

17.42. Loc. sg. -āne: *adhvāne* Mv i.60.3; 271.19; ii.209.9; iii.138.9 (all prose).

17.43. Loc. sg. -āni, chiefly m.c. for *-āne*, but also sometimes, apparently, in positions where short final is not required: *adhvāni* SP 46.6; 48.12; 58.14; 67.11; 145.8; 207.8; 217.9; 336.8, 11; all vss, and generally m.c.; but in 336.8, 11 at the end of prior anuṣṭubh pādas, where *-e* would be metrically as good as *-i*; in 336.8, in fact, Kashgar rec. *adhvāne*; in 11 only two Nep. mss. are reported as reading *°ne* (Kashgar rec. not reported).

17.44. Nom. pl. masc. -ānās: *śvānāḥ* SP 83.12 (v.l. *śvānā*).

17.45. Inst. pl. -ānais: *-rājānaiḥ* Mmk 38.20; 129.22 (both prose).

17.46. Inst. pl. -ānehi: Mv (all prose): *rājānehi* Mv i.267.6; ii.485.6, 16, 20; iii.20.2; *pratirājānehi* ii.485.3; iii.44.4.

17.47. Loc. pl. -āneṣu: *rājāneṣu* Mv iii.24.13 (prose).

Epenthesis of vowel before *n*

17.48. In a few cases we find epenthesis of a vowel, *a* or *i*, before *n* of weak-grade endings, in places where it would not occur in Skt. but can be paralleled from MIndic.

17.49. First a couple of forms with epenthetic *a*, only in verses and presumably m.c.; cf. Pali *muddhanā* (Geiger 92.1). Only inst. sg. *-anā, -ana*: *mūrdhanā* Mv i.67.11 (vs), v.l. *°dhnanā*; Senart em. *murdhinā* (see § 17.12); *nāmana* Bhad 43 (m.c. for *nāmnā*).

17.50. The epenthetic vowel *i* seems to occur, as in both Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 92, Pischel 399), only in weak forms of *rājan*, for Skt. *rājñ-*; and again only in verses, perhaps m.c.: *dharmarājināṃ* Mv i.76.6, gen. pl.; *kāśirājāno* 305.6, mss., which is metrically impossible, read probably with Senart *°jino* (or alternatively *°jano*; gen. sg.); *dharmarājinaṃ* iii.89.17, mss., read perhaps *°jināṃ*, or keep the reading of mss. (MIndic short *a*), rather than *°jino* with Senart (gen. pl. or sg.); *rājino* iii.386.9 (gen. sg.). On the alleged instr. *mūrdhinā* see §§ 17.12, 49.

Miscellaneous non-Sanskritic forms

17.51. Nom. sg. masc. -ās (on the ending *-a*, which may represent *-ā*, m.c., see above § 17.6): *-ās*, perhaps analogical to masc. *s*-stems, as in *ṛ*-stems (§ 13.30); the Skt. ending *-ās* of *s*-stems appears in MIndic as *-ā*, like *n*-stems, and the final *s* may have been analogically 'restored', by Hypersanskritism, in the following: *asaṃpramoṣadharmāḥ* SP 318.12 (prose), mss.; ed. em. *-dharmā*.

17.52. Voc. sg. masc. -ā, nom. used as voc., or for *-a*? *kāśirājā* Mv ii.225.6 (vs), so one ms., required by meter; Senart with v.l. *°ja*.

17.53. Voc. sg. masc. -e, as in Pali, analogical to fem. stems with nom. *ā*; so also in *ṛ*-stems, § 13.9: Mv: *brahme* iii.316.21; 365.5; 419.5; *mahābrahme* 359.12 = 360.7 (these in vss); iii.215.1 (mss.; prose).

17.54. Acc. sg. masc. -ā, apparently nom. used as acc.: *dadāmi saṃghe . . . ātmā kunālaṃ ca . . .* Divy 403.30 (vs) 'I give to the order . . . myself and Kunāla.' I see no other possible interpretation; ed. prints *ātmākunālaṃ* as cpd. Meter requires a long final in *ātmā*.

17.55. Acc. sg. masc. -āna, m.c. for *-ānaṃ*: *rājāna* SP 115.5; *ātmāna* 324.4.

17.56. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -ā, m.c. for *-a* (?): *nāmā* SP 68.2, Kashgar rec., for Nep. mss. *nāmnas*; KN em. *nāmnā*, kept by WT without note.

17.57. Gen. sg. -ānas, -āno, as if from strong stem; but probably only m.c. for *-anas*: *mahātmāno*, *°naḥ* Mmk 59.23; 225.1 (both vss).

17.58. Gen. sg. -(a)na, for *-(a)nas*, *-(a)no*, m.c.: *ātmana* SP 63.13; *rājña* LV 109.16.

17.59. Loc. sg. -(a)nī for *-(a)ni*: (?) *so c' adhvanī* SP 113.5 (see § 4.21); *atīta-m-adhvanī* Samādh 8.21 (here at end of jagatī pāda; no v.l.).

17.60. Nom. pl. masc. -āna, m.c. for *-ānas*: *rājāna* SP 35.13.

17.61. Nom. pl. masc. -nas, acc. pl. used as nom.: *-rājñas* Mmk 20.10 (prose).

17.62. Acc. pl. masc. -ānaḥ, nom. pl. used as acc.: *jātidharmāṇaḥ sattvān* LV 226.19 (prose; so all mss.; only Calc. *°dharmān*); *rājāno* Mv i.276.9 (vs); ii.141.3 (prose); Divy 248.1 (prose; so mss.; ed. em. *rājño*); *pratyekarājāno* Mv ii.270.10 (prose).

17.63. Acc. pl. masc. -āna, for preceding, m.c., but also once in prose: *ātmāna saṃjānatāṃ* SP 71.3 (prose; but perhaps misprint for *°naṃ* or *°naḥ*; ms. 'K' *°naṃ*; WT em. *ātmānaḥ*); *paribhāvitātmāna jinendraputrān* 12.9 (vs); *ātmāna nivartayantaḥ* 196.6 (vs).

17.64. Inst. pl. -ābhis? m.c.? *nāga-rājebhi* Suv 157.11 (vs), so Nobel; mss. *°rājābhiḥ* or *°rājaiś ca*; the latter is evidently a secondary correction, and we must probably read *°rājābhiḥ* m.c. for *°rājabhiḥ*. The final visarga makes no difference metrically, at the end of a pāda.

18. NT-stems

18.1. Very common are *a*-stem forms based on an extension in *a* of the strong stem in *nt*, that is in *-nta*. These are common in Pali and Prakrit (Geiger 96 ff., Pischel 397). Much less common are similar *a*-extensions of the weak stem in *-t*, giving stem *-(a)ta* (not recorded in Geiger, but occasionally found in Pkt., Pischel 398). From stems in both *-ant(a)-* and *-at(a)-* are even made feminines in *-antā*, *-atā* (instead of *-antī*, *-atī*). Thirdly, but not very commonly, we find *a*-stems from which *nt* is completely lost, leaving e. g. stem *arha* for *arhant*; they are also known, tho not common, in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 96.2, 97.2; Pischel 398); the fem. is again *-ā*. There are moreover a few cases in which an *nt*-stem is replaced by an *n*-stem. After these we shall list some cases of confusion between strong and weak stems (with consonantal endings), and then some miscellaneous 'irregularities'. Among these are included the few and rare confusions between Skt. *mant* or *vant* endings and *ant* endings (nom. sg. masc.).

18.2. The stem *mahānt*, which in Skt. has long *ā* in the strong forms, frequently has MIndic shortening of this *a*. Most of the examples are otherwise MIndic and will be recorded in their proper places below. We note here the acc. sg. masc. *mahantaṃ* (= *mahāntaṃ*) SP 69.11 (prose); Mv i.27.11 (prose). Often the mss. vary between *ā* and *a*; SP 72.3 (prose) mss. mostly *mahantaṃ* or *mahāntaṃ*, nt., ed. *mahat* with 2 Nep. mss.; 82.12 *mahantaṃ*, Nep. mss. *mahā°*; also nom. pl. 84.11 *mahantāś*, Nep. mss. *mahā°*, etc.

18.3. The composition form of this stem, in Skt. almost always *mahā-*, may appear as *mahat-*, as rarely in Skt., BR s.v. (where *mahadbhaya* is cited). In the following (all from verses) it is impossible to interpret this form otherwise than as part of a cpd.: *sumahadbhaye* LV 325.18; *mahadbhayaṃkarā* Mv i.10.1; *mahatsvarāḥ* i.100.8; *mahatphalāni* (Bhvr.) i.291.19 (= Pali *mahapphalāni*, Kh.p. 6.6); *mahadbhayo* ii.226.7; *sthānaṃ mahadbhayaṃ* Laṅk 257.1, 'place of great danger', cited with *mahābhayaṃ* Śikṣ 132.7.

Stem *-nta*

18.4. Very common in all parts of Mv, prose as well as verse. In most texts common in verse but occasional in prose.

18.5. Stem in composition (and before suffix *-tara*): *asantagrāhātu* (= *asadgrāhāt*) SP 92.9 (vs); *asantabhāvam* 48.6 (vs); *arhantaśabda-* 56.12 (vs); *mahanta-* 110.14 ff. (vs; ed. with Kashgar rec.; Nep. mss. *mahānta-*). — *arhantaghātakā* Mv i.26.11 (prose). — *ojovanta-tarā* Suv 164.8 (vs) 'stronger'. — *anutpadanta-pūrvāṇi* RP 59.18 (prose; so, to be taken as one cpd. word; ed. separates), 'not arising before' (. . . *cittāny utpannāni*). — *balavanta-tarā* KP 83.3, 7 (prose) 'more powerful'; *śīlavanta-pratirūpaka* 134.1, 6 etc. (prose); *santāsanta-vicitra-* Laṅk 151.3 (prose), 'existent and non-existent'.

18.6. Nom. sg. masc. -ntaḥ, -nto etc. SP (common, only in vss): *anucaṅkramanto* SP 61.10; *vicintayantaḥ* 62.7; *chādayanto* 126.2; *santaḥ* 111.1 'being'.—LV (only vss): *kampayanto* LV 56.9; *santo* 126.18; *mahanto* 169.20; *sumahāntaḥ* 287.3; *bhāṣanto* 438.12. — *gaveṣanto* Mv i.3.10 (prose); *bhāvayanto* 4.3 (prose); *santo* 53.2 (prose); *vilokayanto* 143.7; *rudanto* 156.11; *mahanto* 246.3 (prose); ii.142.20. — *mahatyāgavanto* Suv 225.10 (vs; so read with v.l. [°*ttyā*°], m.c.; text *mahā°*). — *praśamanto* Bhad 21. — *santaḥ* Sukh 22.16 (vs).

18.7. Nom. sg. masc. -nta, in vss, m.c. for preceding: *mārganta* SP 115.8; *nirnādayanta* 126.4. — *caranta* RP 27.11, 18.

18.8. Nom. sg. masc. -ntu, as preceding, m.c. for *-ntas*: *śocantu* SP 111.4; *damayantu* 118.6; *gacchantu tiṣṭhantu* 128.11. — *tyāgavantu sthāmavantu* LV 170.20; *prārthentu* 223.14. — *carantu* Mv ii.375.12.

18.9. Nom. sg. fem. -ntā: *bhaktimantā* Mv ii.235.3 = *bhaktimatī*; *sparśavantā* iii.54.6 = *sparśavatī*. (Both prose).

18.10. Voc. sg. -nta: *arhanta* SP 147.3 (vs).

18.11. Acc. sg. fem. -ntāṃ, and m.c. *-nta*: *pibantāṃ ca kanyāṃ* Mmk 56.8 (prose), 'and the girl while she drinks'; *ulkāṃ paśyati niṣkramanta nagarāt* LV 194.19 (vs), 'she saw a meteor going out from the city'. So Tib.: groṅ khyer dag nas me sgron phyir byuṅ.

18.12. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -ntaṃ: *mahantaṃ* SP 72.3, read so (with Kashgar rec.) or *mahāntaṃ* (with most Nep. mss.) for ed. *mahat*; *sarvāvantaṃ* 72.7 (prose); *opatantaṃ* (= *avapatat*) 83.2 (vs); *mahantaṃ* (= *mahat*, no v.l. anywhere) 85.3 (vs); 231.9 (prose); 406.8 (prose); (KN) *na sattaṃ nāsattaṃ* (sc. *traidhātukaṃ*) 318.10 (prose), but read with WT *na santaṃ nāsantaṃ*; *kiyantaṃ kuśalaṃ bhavet* 345.6 (vs). — *sarvāvantaṃ* LV 4.14; 291.9, 21 (all prose).—Mv (prose): *prajñāvantaṃ*, *śīlavantaṃ* (*kulaṃ*; note that the LV parallel, 23.19 f., has *śīlavat*, *prajñāvat*) i.197.19 = ii.1.9; *mahāntaṃ* i.355.6; ii.45.8; *ākāravantaṃ* ii.469.18. Also (vs) *mahantaṃ* ii.81.1; etc., common. — *sarvāvantaṃ* Mvy 6328 (misprinted *sarvāntaṃ*; correctly Index and Mironov). — *tāvantaṃ dānaṃ* (nom.) Divy 317.1 (prose); *vyasanaṃ mahāntaṃ* (nom.) 321.14 (prose). — *mahāntaṃ* Suv 96.14 (prose). — *mama santaṃ svāpateyaṃ* Karmav 28.9 (prose) 'the property belonging to me'.

18.13. Inst. sg. -ntena: *gaṇayantena* SP 305.2 (vs); *prayujyantena ghaṭantena vyāyamantena* Mv i.246.4 (prose); *ajānantena* Suv 27.15 (vs).

18.14. Gen. sg. -ntasya: SP (all vss): *prakāśayantasy' ima(m)* SP 150.3; 154.16; *udāharantasya* 152.2; *bhāṣantasya* 236.12; read with Kashgar rec. *tahiṃ ca viharantasya* 237.11. — *praviśantasya* Mv i.235.10 (vs); *abhiniṣkramantasya* (v.l. °*matasya*) ii.150.10 (prose); *niryāntasya* 150.12 (prose); *bharantasya* 213.2. — *śīlavantasya* KP 136.2 ff. (vss).

18.15. Loc. sg. -nte: *arhante* Mv i.111.11 (vs); *praviśante* 235.14 (vs; so mss., submetrical line; Senart em. °*ntasmiṃ*); *abhiniṣkramante* ii.163.20 (prose); *sante* 345.11 (vs); *mahānte* iii.121.11 (vs). — *sagarutmante* Mmk 457.20 (vs); *garutmante* 458.10 (vs).

18.16. Loc. sg. -nti, only in vss, and probably only m.c. for *-nte* (it could also be described as a strong-stem loc. in *-i*, instead of Skt. *-ati*): *vrajanti* SP 383.10; *niṣkramanti* LV 237.14; *praviśanti* or *viśanti* Mv i.237.4, mss., at end of line, submetrical by one or two short syllables; Senart's em. *praviśantasmiṃ* is metrically impossible; probably a monosyllable was lost after *praviśanti*; *lujjanti*

or *lujyanti* Mv ii.371.3 (so read with mss.; Senart's em. *lujjante* is unmetrical).

18.17. Nom. pl. masc. -ntās (with normal Skt. saṃdhi): SP (all vss): *vicintentā* (*v-*) 35.4; *karontāś* (*ca*) 83.14; *mahontāś* (*ca*; Nep. mss. *mahā°*) 84.11; *parivarjayantāḥ* 98.1; *dhṛtimantāś* (*c-*; in same line *smṛtimanto*) 303.7; *ṛddhimantā* (*v-*) 306.6. — *upanīyantā vikrośantā a-* Mv i.132.9 (prose); *abhinandantāḥ* 153.3 (vs); *kathentā* (*r-*) 215.8 (corruptly repeated ii.18.5). — *ajānantāḥ abu(d)dhyantāḥ* KP 106.2 (prose). — *vicarantā* (*g-*) RP 29.2 (vs).

18.18. Nom. pl. masc. -ntā, MIndic for *-ntās*: *smarantā* (*k-*) SP 274.3 (vs), so ed. with Nep. mss., Kashgar rec. (also La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1911.1076) *smaranta* (metr. inferior); *dhārentā* (*s-*), 281.2 (vs), Kashgar rec. *dhārenti* (metr. inferior). — *saṃsarantā ca* Mv i.101.14 (vs); *kathayantā* (end of line) 215.9 = (corruptly) ii.18.6 (vs).

18.19. For a possible nom. pl. masc. ending *-nti*, for *-nte*, see § 8.31.

18.20. Acc. pl. masc. -ntān (*-ntāṃ*, before a vowel also *-ntām*): *prakāśayantān* SP 9.12 (vs); *vivarjayantān* 13.9 (vs). — *namantāṃ* LV 197.14. — *vedayantāṃ* Mv i.6.4 (prose); *paribhujantāṃ* 27.5 (prose), *pibantāṃ* 6; *cyavantān* (so, or *°tām*, mss., Senart *°tāṃ*) *upapadyantāṃ* 228.13 (prose); *dīpyantām* (*i-*) ii.28.6 (vs), so mss., Senart *°tāṃ*. — *iyantān* MSV iii.21.4 (prose).

18.21. Acc. pl. masc. -ntā: *anubhontā* Mv i.5.14 (prose); *kuṭṭīyantā* (*a-*, with hiatus) 6.5 (prose).

18.22. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -ntāni: Mv (all prose): *patantāni* Mv ii.30.17; *abhipatantāni* 18; *krīḍantāni* 109.9; *ākāravantāni* 463.5.

18.23. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -ntā: *mahantā* SP 87.8 (vs; with *yānaka* = *yānāni*; but Nep. mss. *mahāntāḥ*, masc.); *jala* (= *jalāni*) *lolayantā* LV 196.16 (vs).

18.24. Inst. pl. -ntais: *ṛddhimantair* Suv 160.5 (vs).

18.25. Inst. pl. -ntebhi(s): *arhantebhi* (v.l. *°bhiś*) *ca* LV 388.13 (vs; either reading is possible metrically).

18.26. Dat. pl. -ntebhyas: *arhantebhyaḥ* Mv i.158.7.

18.27. Gen. pl. -ntānām: *arhantānām* Mv i.59.7, 11 (prose); *vasantānāṃ* 125.1, *cyavantānāṃ* 2, and others (all in vss) lines 3, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, etc.; *saṃkramantānāṃ* 136.4 (prose); *pratikramantānāṃ* 158.14 (prose); *mahantānāṃ* ii.260.15, 16 (prose; v.l. both times *mahā°*).

18.28. Gen. pl. -ntānaṃ, MIndic for preceding: *ravantānaṃ* (so, or *°tāna*, mss.; Senart em. *°tānāṃ*) Mv i.6.1 (prose).

18.29. Gen. pl. -ntāna, in vss, m.c. for *-ntānāṃ*: *parṣavantāna* SP 303.13; *vīryavantāna* 306.1. — *prakāśayantāna* Sukh 45.11.

18.30. Gen. pl. -ntān', before vowel, m.c. for *-ntānām*: *teṣa . . . aśraddadhantān' ima . . .* SP 95.8.

18.31. Loc. pl. -nteṣu: *āgacchanteṣu* Mv i.21.6 (prose); *guṇavanteṣu* 277.7 (vs).

Stem in *-ta*

18.32. Stem in composition: *mahata-janaiḥ* LV 241.9 (= *mahājanaiḥ*; vs; Lefm. prints as two separate words); *tāvata-niṣṭha* (one word, not two) Bhad 46.

18.33. Nom. sg. masc. -tas, -to: *ṛddhimato naraḥ* SP 111.13 (vs); *smarato* 448.6 (vs; repeated in the following vss).—LV (all vss): *nidhyāyato* LV 110.20; *vasato* (= *vasan*) 167.1; *smarato* 167.3; *vipaśyato* 177.11; *yāvataś* (*c-*) 368.19, 20. — *bhagavato* Mv i.104.20 (vs); *samanveṣato* 199.19 (prose; so with mss.; Senart em. *°nto*); *vapuṣmato* 221.16 = ii.24.3 (vs; so certainly read in both passages, mss. vary). — *nirīkṣatas* (= *nirīkṣan*) RP 54.14 (vs).

18.34. Nom. sg. masc. -ta, m.c. for preceding: *prayujyata* RP 21.7 (m.c. for *°taḥ* = *prayujyan*).

18.35. Nom. sg. masc. -tu, m.c. for *-to*: *krandatu* LV 341.13; *dharma śṛṇotu* (for *śṛṇotas* = *śṛṇvan*, pple. formed in MIndic fashion on stem *śṛṇont-*, weak *śṛṇot-*, § 28.62, extended by *-a*; so Tib. chos mñan pas kyaṅ; not 3 sg. impv.) *na vindati tṛptiṃ* 364.5. — *ośiratu* Gv 255.14 'sending forth'.

18.36. Nom. sg. fem. -ta, m.c. for *-tā*, fem. to *-ta(s)*: *yāvata* Bhad 46 (twice; with *niṣṭha, niṣṭhā*).

18.37. Voc. sg. masc. -tā, for *-ta* (see § 8.27): *paramatidhunatā* LV 362.4 (vs, end of line; *dhunatā* for *dhunata* = *dhunan*, voc. of pres. pple. *dhunant*, to Skt. *dhunāti*).

18.38. Acc. sg. masc. -taṃ: *bandhumataṃ rājānaṃ* (so mss.; ed. em. *°mantaṃ*) Divy 284.1 (prose).

18.39. Acc. sg. masc. -tu, only in vss m.c.: *dhyāyatu bodhisattvaṃ* LV 134.12; *bodhisattvaṃ jvalatu* 241.6.

18.40. Acc. sg. fem. -tāṃ: *tiṣṭhatāṃ* Mv i.305.9 (so mss.; vs, metr. indifferent; Senart em. *tiṣṭhantīṃ*).

18.41. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -tam, -taṃ: *vasumataṃ* (for *°mat*) Mv i.35.14 (prose), name of a city (always *a*-stem in this story); *prasūyataṃ* = *prasūyat* Laṅk 9.2 (vs), 'that which is being born', pres. pple.; in cpd. *vandhyā-prasūyataṃ*, 'the offspring of a barren woman'.

18.42. Inst. sg. -tena: (*kaṇṭhakaṃ*) *pallānatena* Mv ii.160.4 (prose; so mss., to be kept), pple. of *pallānati*, q.v. Dict.; *śīlavatena* Mmk 76.27 (prose).

18.43. Gen. sg. -tasya: *bhagavatasya* Mv i.74.6 (vs); *praviśatasya* Mmk 463.17 (but meter is imperfect).

18.44. Loc. sg. -te: *vasumate* Mv i.36.3, 10, etc.; 45.6 (all prose).

18.45. Nom. dual -tau: *rakṣatau* Mv ii.219.1 (prose; so the sole ms.; lacuna in the other); subject *mātāpitarau*, '(are) guarding', a kind of periphrasis for a finite verb. No need to emend with Senart.

18.46. Nom. pl. masc. -tā, MIndic for *-tās, -tāḥ*, which latter may be intended Mv i.153.3; in the others here cited, *-tā* is followed always by voiceless consonants: *mahatā prākāra* LV 193.6 (vs). — *mahatā parvatā* Mv i.13.11 (vs); *abhikāṅkṣatā iti* 153.3 (vs, end of line), so read with mss., = Skt. *abhikāṅkṣantaḥ*; Senart em. unnecessarily to *°kṣitaṃ* (as acc. sg., with the object); *āharatā* 340.7 (prose; so one ms., v.l. *āhāratā*; Senart em. *āharantā*; followed by *t-*).

18.47. Nom. pl. fem. -tā(s): *bhūmayo daśa jināna śrīmatā* Mv i.64.2 (vs; so 5 mss., 1 *śrīmato*; Senart em. *śrīmatāṃ*; but construe with *bhūmayo*).

18.48. Acc. pl. masc. (-tān), -tāṃ: *kṣīyatāṃ* Mv i.5.4 (prose) 'being destroyed', so 4 mss. (Senart with 2 mss. *kṣīyantā*); (*buddhāṃ*) *bhagavatāṃ* Mmk 63.17; 229.23 (both prose).

18.49. Acc. pl. masc. -tā, MIndic for preceding (nom. used as acc.): *anubhavatā* Mv i.5.3 (so all mss.; prose; Senart em. *°vantā*).

18.50. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -tāni: *iyatāni* Divy 112.16 (prose).

18.51. Gen. pl. -tānāṃ: *-prativahatānāṃ* Bbh 157.6 (prose).

Forms based on stem in *-a*

18.52. Stem -a in composition: *arha-gaṇa* (Corr.; for *arhad°*) LV 436.1 (prose). — *anantav-udagrāḥ* Mv i.83.8 (so mss.; vs; stem *anantava*, final vowel lost in saṃdhi; Senart em. *°ūdagro*, *ū* being demanded by meter; for *anantavad-u°*). — *arha-parivāro* Divy 148.9; 159.15 (so mss. both times, prose; ed. em. *arhat°* in 148.9).

18.53. The stem *saṃprajāna*, for *°na(n)t*, = Pali *sampajāna*, occurs in composition in KP 123.2 (prose) *saṃprajāna-cārī* 'behaving (or walking) circumspectly', and especially in *saṃprajāna-mṛṣāvāda* 'a conscious lie' (Pali *sampajāna-musāvāda*), Mvy 9266 (so read with Mironov, no v.l.; Kyoto text *saṃprajānan mṛ°*, citing *°na-* in note); Mv ii.131.6, 7; 240.18; Prāt 502.15 (all prose). In Divy 70.16; 71.18 *saṃprajānan-mṛṣāvāda* (ed. prints as two words, wrongly), altho elsewhere (618.4) Divy

has (in prose) *saṃprajānā* as nom. sg. fem. On *garutma-(sthaṃ)* see below, § 18.66.

18.54. Stem -aṃ in composition (as if nt. sg. for *-ad!*): *iyaṃduḥkhā hi . . . nārakāḥ* (or *nar°*) Divy 375.15, 21; 376.1, 9 (all prose) 'the hell-inhabitants (hells) have torments to this extent'. The ed. suggests in note reading *iyaddu°*. But cf. the Skt. use of *idaṃ-* as 'stem' in composition.

18.55. Nom. sg. masc. -as, -o etc. *saṃprajānas*, or *-no* (the latter often without regard to Skt. saṃdhi, especially in Mv), for Skt. *°nan* 'conscious': SP 29.1 (prose) *°nas* (so read with WT and virtually all mss.; KN *°jñānas*); Mv i.150.6 (vs); 206.4 = ii.9.20 (prose); i.218.10 = ii.20.11 (prose); ii.298.9, 15 (vss; in all these *°no*); ii.366.11 (vs) *°naś ca*; 383.1 (vs) *°no*, etc., passim; Ud xv.5 (vs) *°naḥ*. The regularized nom. *saṃprajānan* occurs, however, even in Mv (e. g. ii.283.9 *°naṃ*, prose) as well as elsewhere (e. g. LV 343.19, prose).—Other forms: Mv *araho* (= *arhan*) i.37.6; 38.11 (both prose); *arcimo* i.216.18 (prose); 225.6, 16 (vss); *bandhumo* ii.271.5 (prose); *bandhumas* (v.l. *°mano*, see § 18.67) iii.231.1 (prose).

18.56. There are also, in verses, forms ending in *-a*, like *bhava*, *saṃprajāna*, certainly m.c., which might be considered to represent *-as*, *-o*, but which may also be treated as m.c. for *-an* or MIndic *-aṃ*, below, § 18.79.

18.57. Nom. sg. fem. -ā: *hrīmā* (for *°matī*) LV 28.13 (vs); *saṃprajānā* Divy 618.4 (prose).

18.58. Acc. sg. masc. -aṃ: *-sthāmavaṃ* LV 110.21 (vs); *arhaṃ . . . pratijānīṣe* 405.22 (prose; so certainly read with Lefm.; the mss. all corrupt; mostly they read *ahaṃ*, but the parallel 406.4 *jinaṃ* proves the reading intended. —Mv (all prose): *arcimaṃ* Mv i.215.11; *mahaṃ ca oghaṃ* ii.260.11 (repeated 261.11 with *mahāntaṃ* instead of *mahaṃ*); *pāpīmaṃ* ii.270.19; 287.7 (here mss. *pāpīmāṃ*); 404.21 (in line 20 nom. sg. *pāpīmāṃ*); *bandhumaṃ* iii.230.16.

18.59. Acc. sg. masc. -a, m.c. for preceding: *daṇḍu . . . śrīma* LV 194.16 (vs).

18.60. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. -aṃ: *kulaṃ śuddha susaṃprajānaṃ* LV 27.19 (vs); *vyādhimaraṇaṃ na kupitarupavaṃ* LV 327.14 (vs; m.c. for *°rūpavaṃ* = *rūpavat*; so we must read with Lefm. for mss. *kupitaṃ rupavas*, or *rūpavas*, impossible in both meter and sense); *śrīmaṃ* Mv i.209.9 (end of line of vs; with *gagaṇaṃ*; = ii.11.16 where *śrīmad*). Cf. *iyaṃ-duḥkha*, § 18.54, stem in composition.

18.61. Inst. sg. -ena: Mv (all prose): *arcimena* Mv i.227.4, 12; 231.8; *gatimena smṛtimena dhṛtimena matimena* i.229.9; *tena yāyena* i.232.6 'by him as he was going', for *yāyatā* (Skt. *yātā*); so mss. (one *jāyena*), Senart em. *yāyinā*; *gatimena smṛtimena matimena dhṛtimena dyutimena* ii.133.10. — *saṃprajānena* Hoernle MR 5.1 ff. (prose), repeatedly; Hoernle wrongly says this stands for *saṃprajñānena*.

18.62. Gen. sg. -asya: *arcimasya* Mv i.200.1 (prose), and (vss) i.200.3; 201.5, 7; 221.18; *bandhumasya* Mv ii.271.7 (prose); *saṃprajānasya* Gv 202.2 (prose).

18.63. Loc. sg. fem. -āyāṃ: *bandhumāyāṃ* (= *°matyāṃ*) Mv i.51.7 (prose); *saṃprajānāyāṃ* Mv i.205.8 = ii.9.4 (prose).

18.64. Nom. pl. masc. -ās: *saṃprajānāḥ* (no v.l.) Suv 9.14 (prose); *smṛtīmāḥ* (= *smṛtimantaḥ*) Gv 476.22 (vs).

18.65. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. -āni, -ā, -a: *rajata-śrīmāṇi* (= *śrīmanti*) Mv ii.36.6 (vs); *vitatha dukha* (so read m.c. for *duḥkha*) *mahā* LV 362.7 (vs; read thus as three separate words, text as one cpd.), something like 'falsities and great evils', object of *tyaji*; for Skt. *vitathāni duḥkhāni mahānti*.

Substitution of *n* for *nt* stem forms

18.66. There is some, tho scanty, evidence for this substitution. Such forms may be analogical to the nom. sg. in *-ā* (lacking final nasal) which is regular for *nt*-stems in Pali (cf. § 18.77); and/or to the composition stem-form in *-a* (above, § 18.52 f.); cf. *garutma-sthaṃ* below. Of printed texts available to me, I have found forms of this type only in Mmk, in Chapters 40 (latter part) and 41, from pages 455 to 469. Here occurs the stem-form in composition *garutma-(stham)* 456.6 (vs); and the nom. sg. *garutmā* 460.6 and 11 (prose); these are the two possible sources for *n*-stem forms that have occurred to me. There are further inst. sg. *garutmanā* 455.13 (vs), dat. sg. *garutmane* 467.13 (vs); and gen. pl. *garutmanāṃ* 460.9 (prose).

18.67. Attention may also be called to a variant at Mv iii.231.1 (prose), where Senart reads in the text *bandhumas*, nom. sg. (for Skt. *bandhumān*, or—since *t-* follows—*°māṃs*), with one ms.; but the other ms. reads *bandhumano*, which, if original, could only be nom. sg. masc. of an *n*-stem extended by *-a* (cf. § 17.24).

Strong stem used for the weak and vice versa

18.68. Inst. sg. -ntā: *ajānantā* Suv 25.5; *aprajānantā* Suv 26.1, both vss; reading uncertain but seems to me (following Nobel) probable.

18.69. Gen. sg. -ntaḥ: *bhagavantaḥ* (but WT *°vataḥ* with ms. K') *śākyamuneḥ* SP 390.5 (prose); (?) *mahānto* Mv ii.137.11 (v.l.; Senart with one ms. *mahato*); in LV 396.7 (prose) and ff., read almost certainly *tathāgatasyārhantaḥ*, repeatedly, with most mss. including the best, for Lefm. and Calc. *°rhataḥ*; *mahaduḥkhaṃ pañcaskandhaṃ dharanto* LV 191.7 (vs), either 'a great misery is the 5-skandha group for one who bears (it)' or 'there is great misery for one who bears the 5-skandha group'. Tib. seems to support the general sense: ḥon kyaṅ phuṅ po lṅa ḥdzin sdug bsṅal che yin na.

18.70. Nom. pl. -tas, -to, from weak stem: LV (all vss); *kathayato* LV 47.11; *bhāṣato* 74.14; *vicarato* 114.11; (?) *praharṣayato* 415.3 (seems to mean 'causing delight', agreeing with preceding nouns, subjects of *tyakta* = *tyaktāḥ*). — *āvṛṃhato* Mv i.13.2 (vs), so read with mss.; nom. pl. with *-patrā* (preceding line), which to be sure is normally neuter; read also with mss. *-māṃsa-rudhiraṃ vā*; render 'tearing off the very skin, flesh, and blood, would remove them'. — *dhāvataḥ* Divy 218.23; 219.1, 9 (all prose), '(are) running', a sort of periphrastic present for *dhāvanti*. — *prabhāsataḥ* RP 5.12 (vs); *prayujyato* 27.17 (vs). — *vikurvayato* (= *vikurvantaḥ*) Gv 267.3 (vs).

18.71. Nom. pl. -ta, m.c.: *yāvata* (= *yāvantaḥ*) Bhad 1, 14, 15, 58.

18.72. Acc. pl. -ntas, -nto, from strong stem: (*tān . . .*)*buddhā* (Lefm. em. *buddhān*) *bhagavanto 'nusmaranti sma* LV 4.8 (prose); *iyanto bodhisattvān* 31.6 (prose); *bruvantaḥ* 197.16 (vs); *rodantaḥ krandantaḥ* 302.4 (prose). — *viruvantaḥ* RP 55.7 (vs). — *kāṃścid abhiṣṭavantaḥ* Gv 519.22 (prose).

18.73. Acc. pl. -nta, -ntu, in verses m.c.: *śuṣyanta . . . sthapeyaṃ* SP 128.2; *sīdanta . . . uddhariṣye* RP 45.3; *kurvantu pūjā* (read *pūja* m.c.; acc. sg.) LV 222.15.

18.74. Gen. pl. -ntaṃ, MIndic for *-ntāṃ* = *-tāṃ*: *teṣāṃ dāni āgacchantaṃ* (Senart em. *āgacchatāṃ*) *śabdaṃ karonti* Mv i.18.10 (prose).

Miscellaneous non-Sanskritic forms

18.75. Nom. sg. masc. Here we shall not record spellings with final anusvāra for *n*, like *kathayaṃ* for *kathayan* LV 157.19, *gatīmāṃ* (so all mss.) for *gatīmān* (*ī* m.c.) LV 145.11 (ed. em. *gatīnāṃ*; read *gajendraḥ* with ms. A). This I regard as purely orthographic; it is, in any case, a regular way, in our mss., of representing a final nasal, particularly before a consonant.

18.76. We might anticipate confusion between nom. sg. forms in *-an*, from the pres. pple. type in *ant*, with

those in *-ān*, from *mant* and *vant* stems. But actually such confusion seems hardly to occur. I have noted only one or two doubtful cases: (at end of a verse) *arahān* LV 326.17, according to Lefm.; some mss. read *arhān*, the others (with Calc.) *arhan*; *bhagavaṃ* (mss., Senart em. °*vāṃ*), n. sg., Mv iii.65.1; cf. § 25.7.

18.77. It might also have been expected that we should find many nom. sg. forms in *-ā*, since that is the regular Pali ending of *mant* and *vant* stems (so far as they do not have *-anto*), and is found also in participial stems (Geiger 96, 98). It occurs also, but only to a very limited extent, in Pkt. (Pischel 398 end, AMg. *arahā*, *arihā*; M. *Haṇumā*). In our dialect, however, such forms hardly occur. I can cite only *mahā* for *mahān* and *garutmā* for °*mān*. The former seems probably to occur LV 193.9 (tho one excellent ms. reads *mahāṃ*), and Mv i.48.8 = 82.4; 167.4; ii.70.12 (all vss). The latter has been noted only in Mmk in the passage where an *n*-stem *garutman* is otherwise recorded, perhaps as a direct result of analogy from the nom. *garutmā*; see § 18.66.

18.78. Once, in *dviṣad-icchati* Ud xi.10 (vs), the form *dviṣad* seems to occur as masc. Instead of regarding it as a nt. form transferred to the masc., we should probably regard *d* as saṃdhi-consonant; see § 4.64. If so the form is *dviṣa* and belongs in the next paragraph.

18.79. Chiefly in verses, m.c., we find nom. sg. forms in *-a*, which may be regarded as for Skt. *-an* (tho they might also represent the quasi-MIndic *-as*, *-o* which we have met above, § 18.55). *saṃprajānu* LV 135.20, both edd., but all of Lefmann's mss. *saṃprajānaṃ* or (A, probably the best) *saṃprajāna*, which latter fits the meter and must certainly be read (no ms. has °*nu*); *tāḍa* 341.13 'beating', = *tāḍ(ay)an*; *bhava* 366.8, 22; 367.3 (so with v.l. for text *tava*); 369.1, for *bhavan* 'your worship', all m.c. — *namasya* Mv iii.430.11 (vs; m.c. for °*syan*); and (the only apparent occurrence of such a form in prose) *saṃprajāna* ii.132.2, mss. (Senart em. °*naṃ*, for °*nan*; perhaps rightly? but cf. voc. in *-a* § 18.82). — *akarṣaya* RP 52.9, supposedly m.c. for *ākarṣayan*, but see § 3.28.

18.80. Nom. sg. fem.: once the masc. form in °*māṃ* (= °*mān*) is clearly used as fem.: *Sujāta* (m.c. for °*tā*) *matimāṃ* LV 271.21 (vs; no v.l.; so also Calc. glossing *matimatī*).

18.81. Voc. sg. masc.: the nom. ending *-ān* (or *-āṃ*) is used as voc.: *śrīmān* LV 12.6; 13.2 (both vss; all mss.; only Calc. °*man*). — *bhagavāṃ bhagavāṃ* Mv i.245.13 (prose; so, or °*vān*, mss. seem to intend; Senart em. °*vaṃ* °*vaṃ*); *pāpīmāṃ* ii.238.16 (vs; so mss.; Senart em. °*maṃ*).

18.82. The voc. ending *-a*, which may be regarded as the nom. (above) used as voc., or as based on the stem in *-a* (§§ 18.52 ff.), occurs in *maha* LV 170.19 (vs). This is certainly not m.c.; it occurs at the end of a line, in a meter where a long syllable is usually found in that position. Yet all mss. apparently read *maha*.

18.83. Acc. sg. masc. -nta and -ntu, m.c. for °*ntam*, in vss: *mahānta* (all mss.; KN em. *mahanta*, kept by WT) *varṣaṃ* SP 8.12. — *tiṣṭhantu* SP 323.14; *dhyāyantu* LV 132.14; *jvalantu* LV 241.10.

18.84. Inst. sg. -ta, m.c. for *-tā*: *hitavata* (so read, with Tib. phan daṅ ldan pa khyod kyis; mss. *hita-tava*; Lefm. em. *hita bhava*) *tvayi* (inst.) *maru-* (Lefm. em. wrongly *naru*)*-sthalapathi sthapito* LV 166.9.

18.85. Gen. sg. -tu, m.c. for *-tas*, *-to*: *varṣatu* SP 130.9; *niṣkramatu* LV 115.22; *bhavatu* LV 366.3. In Divy 214.4 (prose) is printed the monstrous form *kārayatuḥ*, which I can only suppose to be a misprint or error of mss., probably for *kārayataḥ*, or less likely for *kārayituḥ* from a *tṛ*-stem.

18.86. Nom. pl. masc. -nta, in vss, m.c. for *-ntaḥ*: *smṛtimanta* SP 68.5; 97.7 (WT °*ntu* with ms. K′); 131.3; *balavanta* SP 89.7; *bhāsayanta* RP 12.5.

18.87. Nom. pl. -nte, 'Māgadhism', in *bhavante* (?): uncertain. The mss. read *bhavante* at Mv i.152.5 (except one, an inferior one, °*nto*); but Senart reads *bhavanto* in accord with the mss. at i.225.21 and ii.29.2 where the line is repeated; and perhaps he is right.

18.88. Nom. pl. masc. -vān, i. e. nom. sg. used as pl.: *pratibhānavān sada bhavanti* . . . RP 15.2 (vs). The entire vs has only pl. verbs, nouns, and pronouns. So also mss. Mv i.133.11 (prose; Senart em. °*vantāś*).

18.89. Gen. pl. -tu for -tām, m.c.: *prekṣatu nayanān na cāsti tṛptiṃ* LV 49.16 (vs) 'and there is no satiating of the eyes as they look'. See § 8.124.

19. Numerals

19.1. eka-, 'one', see under pronominal adjectives.

19.2. dva-, dvi- etc., 'two'. This numeral has the following non-Skt. forms. Plural forms (adjectives and verbs) often accompany the numeral (§§ 25.2, 3).

19.3. Nom.-acc. all genders, *duve, dve* (= Pali, both; Pkt. *duve, be*), and (m.c.) *dvi* (Ap. *bi*, Pischel 437). Only noted in Mv, except *triṃśa-duve* Gv 406.15 (vs). — *duve*, masc.: (prose) Mv i.38.1 ff.; 44.5; 359.18; 362.15; 363.6; ii.101.18; iii.26.20; 163.15; 176.8; 415.9; (vss) i.122.14, 16; fem. i.222.12 (here mss. *iva*) = ii.24.20 (vs); in ii.23.6 (vs) read *dvi*, with i.221.1 (same vs), for *duve*, metr. impossible; nt. (prose) i.238.3; (vss) i.116.17; ii.44.18; 169.12. — *dve*, masc. (prose): Mv i.231.19; 361.7; 362.1 — *dvi*, only in vss, m.c.: fem. *dvi vāridhārā* Mv i.221.1 (repeated ii.23.6 with unmetr. *duve*).

19.4. Inst. *dvibhis, dvihi, dvīhi* (= Pali id.), *duvehi* (*dvehi*; this is merely a normal plural form to *duve, dve*; cf. Pali *ubhayehi*, Geiger 114; Pkt. Ś. *duvehiṃ*, Pischel 437; Aśoka *duvehi*, Hultzsch cxix, Pillar Edicts); *dubhi, duhi* (Ap. *duhi*, Jacobi, San. 15). — *dvibhis*: LV 240.13 (vs); SP 330.7 (vs); Mv i.277.21 (vs; mss. *dvibhūs*!). — *dvihi*: (prose) Mv i.25.6; 51.1 (v.l. *dvehi*); 79.10; 195.5; (mss. *dvehi dvihi* 196.4, Senart em. *dvihi dvihi*;) 197.12; iii.227.14; 228.15; (vs) 247.16 *dvihi* (*-m- eva*). — *dvīhi*: (prose) Mv i.233.6 (mss. *dvīpihi*, em. Senart); ii.1.3 (repetition of i.197.12, where *dvihi*); (vs) iii.187.13 (*ī* not m.c.). — *duvehi* Mv i.362.3 (prose). — *dvehi*, see above under *dvihi*. — *dubhi*, Mv i.127.3, 4, 8, acc. to Senart; in 3 only one ms. *duhi*, but in 4 and 8 most mss. *duhi*, only one *dubhi*.

19.5. Gen. pl. *duvinnaṃ, dvinnāṃ* (= Pali *duvinnaṃ, dvinnaṃ*); *dvinnā*? — *duvinnaṃ* Mv ii.49.18 (vs). Genuinely MIndic form, with short *a* in final syllable. — *dvinnāṃ* Mv i.195.10 (prose); mss. *dvinnā*; repeated four times in lines 11–13, the final *ṃ* being recorded only once in one ms.; i.249.7 (prose); iii.228.2 ff. (prose, several cases; one ms. regularly lacks *ṃ* at the end, both mss. lack it once); 370.9 (vs). Should we recognize *dvinnā* as a genuine form?

19.6. Further, *dve-* is prefixed to other numerals in a multiplicative sense (as in Pali, see Childers s.v. *duve, dve*; e. g. *dve-caturaṅga* 'twice fourfold' = 'eightfold'): *dvepañcayojanikāni* Mv i.42.2 'of twice five yojanas' (contrast *dvikrośikāni* in preceding line); *dvecaturaśīti* (once *duve*°) Mv i.259.8; 261.15; 271.15 (here *duve*°; all prose) 'twice 84', as a large number.

19.7. As in Pali, both *ubhe* (m.c. *ubhi*) and *ubhaye* occur as nom. and acc. masc., in analogy with *duve, dve*: *ubhi*, m.c. for *ubhe* (which one ms. reads), Suv 52.9 (acc.). — *ubhaye*, nom., Mv ii.119.2 (corresponding passage LV 239.11 has *ubhāv api*); 171.16 (plural verb).

19.8. tri- etc., 'three'. The stem *tisra-*, based on the fem. *tisṛ-* (cf. § 13.15), occurs in composition with a masc. noun, perhaps m.c.: *tisra-loki* (=*triloke*) LV 54.8 (vs); *tisra-lokeṣu* 56.5 (vs).

19.9. The nom. masc. *trayo* is used as acc.: Mv ii.115.9; iii.428.9 (both prose). The nom.-acc. nt. may be *trīṇī* m.c.: SP 33.4.

19.10. In the inst., *trīhi* and *trihi* occur for *tribhis*; the mss. often vary between the two (cf. Pali *tīhi*, Pkt. *tīhiṃ* and *tihiṃ*, the latter m.c.? Pischel 438): *trihi*, v.l. *trīhi*, Mv i.79.12 (prose), in same line with *tribhir*, v.l. *trībhir*; iii.249.7 (vs, but meter indifferent as to *i*). — *trīhi*: Mv i.238.4 (prose, v.l. *trihi*); 321.18 (prose); ii.40.21 (vs); iii.188.4 (vs); 249.10 (vs, meter indifferent, v.l. *trihi*).

19.11. Further, *trayebhi* occurs, LV 177.1, 13 (vss; cited Śikṣ 240.1; 241.1), apparently as numeral = *tribhis*; it is an analogical creation to Skt. gen. pl. *trayāṇām*.

19.12. In this, as in other numerals, there seems to be exceptional confusion of the originally distinct forms of the three genders; see §§ 6.11 ff.

19.13. catur- etc., 'four'. As in Pali and Pkt., the stem appears as *catu-* in composition, and not only in verses: *catu-tāla-* (no v.l.) Mv ii.313.5 (prose); *catu-varṇa* LV 197.2 (vs). Cf. *catuhi, catuṣu* below.

19.14. As in other numerals, gender-forms are confused; §§ 6.11 ff.

19.15. For the nom., the acc. *caturo* (°*ras*) is often used (as in MIndic); also *cature* (so-called 'Māgadhism', or originally pronominal ending?), and *caturi* which represents the latter in verses m.c. — *caturo* (all vss) LV 12.20; 236.13; 372.2 (*caturaś ca*); 373.13; 385.7; Mv i.114.16; 157.6 (*caturaś ca*); 208.11 (repeated ii.10.19 where mss. *catvāro*, unmetrical; Senart em.); RP 24.16; 55.9. — *cature* (vss) LV 343.9; Mv ii.92.11 (mss.); *cature padāḥ* Ud xii.4 (: Pali *caturo padā*, Dhp. 273; of course not to be emended with Chakravarti to *catvāraḥ*, which in fact is metrically impossible). — *caturi* (vss, m.c.) LV 50.5; 80.20; 81.9; 197.1; Mv i.218.6 = ii.20.5.

19.16. Conversely, *catvāraḥ* (and m.c. °*ra*) is used as acc.: *catvāro dvīpāṃ* Mv i.80.8 (prose); i.168.10 (vs); *catvāra dvīpa susamṛddhā . . . āvasati sarvān* (2d ed. *sarvā*) Gv 254.19 (vs; probably to be divided thus; ed. *catvāra-dvīpa-* as one word, which is conceivable, *catvāra-* as stem in comp.).

19.17. As in the nom., *cature* also occurs in the acc.: *diśāṃ cālokya cature* LV 252.21 (vs; with fem. noun, tho it has a masc. acc. pl. ending).

19.18. For inst. *caturbhis*, there occurs *catuhi* (so Pali), MIndic form based on stem *catu-* (above, and in loc. *catuṣu* below): Mv i.239.11 (prose; Senart em. *caturhi* but mss. *catuhi*). Commoner are *caturhi* and *caturbhi*, especially the former. *caturhi* Mv i.3.12 (v.l. *catuhi*); 6.2; 38.15; 120.8; 120.13 (v.l. *caturbhir*); 230.12; 237.10; 263.17; 318.17; 335.14; ii.33.5; 141.4; 164.17; 423.9 (fem.); all prose. — *caturbhi* Mv i.120.7; 292.15 (both v.l. *caturhi*).

19.19. For gen. *caturṇāṃ*, *caturṇa* is read in vss m.c.: SP 237.13; 294.6 (with fem. noun, *parṣāṇa*).

19.20. For loc. *caturṣu*, we find *catuṣu* LV 418.13 and 17 (prose; cf. Weller 38; § 1.46); and read so Mv ii.141.5 (prose), with v.l., for Senart *caturuṣu* (unparalleled).

19.21. In LV 130.19 (vs) Lefmann's reading *catuṣū* is doubtless correct (*ū* m.c.), tho most mss. and Calc. read *caturṣu*, unmetrically.

19.22. pañca, 'five'. For inst. Skt. *pañcabhis, pañcahi* is fairly common in Mv: i.31.5; ii.25.14 (both prose) etc. It is doubtful whether any other non-Skt. form really occurs. In Mv i.60.14 Senart prints *pañcehi*, but 3 mss. have *pañcahi*. Cf. however *-ehi* forms § 19.28. In ii.257.7 mss. *pañcāhi* or *pañcabhi*; Senart em. *pañcahi*.

19.23. The loc. pl. appears m.c. as *pañcasū* RP 59.6.

19.24. ṣaṣ, 'six'. The loc. pl. occurs as *ṣaṭsū* m.c. SP 9.6; 48.3.—A strange form *ṣaḍi* occurs for 'six' twice in LV, apparently as 'stem' in composition. I cannot explain the final *-i*, unless it is analogical to the ending of *dvi-*, *tri-*. (Cf. Aśokan *saḍu-vīsati*, where *u* has been explained as analogical to *catu-*; Bloch, Asoka, 161 n. 3.) In LV 414.19 (vs) Lefm. prints *ṣaḍi pāramite* (*cirarātru vivardhitu kośu tvayā*); we must certainly divide *pārami* from *te*: 'the six supremacies are thine'. Then *ṣaḍi* could be either nom., or stem in composition (*ṣaḍi-pārami*). But in 420.1 (vs) only the latter seems possible. The ed. reads *ṣaḍindriyair nipatito* (*iti sparśa uktaḥ*), but this is metrically impossible; read *ṣaḍi-indriyair* with A (the best ms.), 'occurred by reason of (caused by) the six senses' (in the *pratītya-samutpāda*).

19.25. sapta, 'seven'. The inst. pl. *saptahi* is not rare in Mv: i.110.5; 128.9 (v.l. *saptehi*); 194.2, 4; 323.13; iii.92.14 (all prose). Gen. *saptanāṃ*, Crit. App. on Mv ii.74.8, but *saptānāṃ* in text 75.21.

19.26. daśa, 'ten'. Several times the text of LV seems to present *daśaḥ* for *daśa*, always after *diśo*, as acc., 'into (all) ten directions' or the like. It occurs at the end of a line of verse LV 311.4 and 387.16 (no v.l. cited); but in prose, followed by *prapalāyamānaṃ*, in 301.10, where Lefm. to be sure reads *daśa* with one inferior ms., while all the other mss. and Calc. have *daśaḥ*. The Tib. confirms the numeral in 387.16; phyogs (= *diś*) bcu (= 10). But in the two other places it reads phyogs phyogs = *diśo-diśaḥ*, 'in all directions' (as also in LV 314.8 where text *diśo daśāsu*). I cannot explain the form *daśaḥ* and suspect that it is only an error for (*diśo-*) *diśaḥ*, tho apparently in one passage (387.16) this error crept into the text before the Tib. translation was made.

19.27. Otherwise we note, as usual, inst. pl. *daśahi*, Mv i.148.1 (prose); and loc. pl. *daśasū*, m.c., SP 53.11; 342.12; Suv 42.8 (Nobel °*su* with his mss., but Śikṣ 219.6 cites the verse correctly with °*sū*).

19.28. Teens. We have met above, §§ 19.22, 25 (and cf. *trayebhi* § 19.11), inst. pl. forms in *-ehi*, at least as variants in mss. Some of the teens show similar forms, better attested: *dvādaśehi* Mv i.196.21 (prose). — *tridaśehi* id. i.204.14 = ii.8.9 (vs). And *ṣoḍaśehi* occurs as v.l. for *ṣoḍaśahi* of Senart's text in Mv i.198.13 = ii.2.15; ii.179.7 (all prose). If some of these forms in *-ehi* are genuine, as seems likely, they are easily explained as analogical to the regular Skt. gens. pl. *trayāṇāṃ*, *pañcānāṃ*, *saptānāṃ*, *daśānāṃ*, etc., which look like normal *a*-stem forms; hence we need not find surprising the creation of inst. plurals which, in this dialect, are normal in *a*-stems.

19.29. Tens. As in Epic Skt. (Whitney 475e), the endings *-at* and *-ati* are interchanged, e. g. *viṃśac ca* (for *viṃśati*) SP 114.12 (vs); *triṃśati* (v.l. *triṃśaṃ*; for *triṃśat*) Mv ii.132.18 (prose); *pañcāśati* SP 95.1 (vs).

19.30. Further, any of the tens from 20 to 50 inclusive, whether ending regularly in *-at* or *-ati*, may be replaced by a stem in *-a*, which may be used in that form (apparently) as an independent word (but sometimes, possibly always, this is to be construed as prior member of a cpd.); or it may be treated as an *a*-stem, appearing as nt. nom. *-aṃ* (perhaps then to be identified with the collectives of this form, Wackernagel III p. 419), or as nom. pl. *-āḥ*. Thus:

19.31. Forms in *-a*: *putrāḥ priyā orasā viṃśa* (m.c. for *viṃśat* or *viṃśaṃ*?) *bālāḥ* SP 88.3 (vs); *triṃśa koṭyo* (cpd.? or read *triṃśat* with 3 mss.?) Mv i.174.14 (vs, but metr. indifferent); *triṃśa-goṣṭhikā* Mv iii.375.13 ff. (prose) '30 companions', repeatedly; printed as cpd. by Senart, who in 376.15 adopts the v.l. *triṃśad-go*°; *pañcāśa koṭīyo* (cpd.?) Mv i.174.16 (vs, but metr. indifferent); in Mv i.117.15, at end of line of vs, text *pañcāśaṃ* but v.l. *pañcāśa*.

19.32. Forms in *-aṃ*: *viṃśaṃ*, *triṃśaṃ* Mv ii.284.9 (prose); *pañcāśaṃ* Mv i.115.13 (vs); 117.15 (vs, cf. above); ii.133.1; 284.10 (both prose; one ms. has *catvāriṃśaṃ* before *pañcāśaṃ* in the last passage).

19.33. Forms in *-āḥ*: *cature ca viṃśā*(*ḥ*) LV 343.9 (vs), '24'.

19.34. Far rarer, indeed hardly to be found, is the addition of *-a* to such a stem as *triṃśat*; it seems to be implied by *dvātriṃśatākāra*, 'of 32 forms' (°*śata-ākāra*) Mv ii.278.21; 279.2; 280.12. The only alternative would seem to be emendation to °*śad-ākāraṃ*; Senart notes no v.l.

19.35. The compounds *caturāśīti*, 84, and *ṣaḍāśīti*, 86, appear in this form, with lengthened *ā* (see Dict.), which cannot be m.c.; the forms occur in prose and in metrically indifferent positions, as likewise in Pali *caturāsīti*, *chaḷāsīti*; cf. also AMg. *caurāsīiṃ* (Pischel 446). Evidently the forms are due to the analogical influence of compounds in which the prior numeral ended in *a*, producing *-ā-* by saṃdhi with the initial *a-*, such as *pañcāśīti*, *saptāśīti*, *aṣṭāśīti*. — We even find *catvāri āśīti* for 84 in Dbh.g. 44(70).25; but in this broken form *ā-* may possibly be m.c.

19.36. Ordinals may be formed, as in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 118.2; Pischel 449) by adding *-ma* to the cardinal: *ekanavatime* '91st' Mv ii.271.5 (prose). Tho not standard Skt., such formations occur in epic and 'late' Skt., Wackernagel III p. 409. A blend of **pañcāśatima* (Pali *paññāsatima*, Geiger 118) with Skt. *pañcāśa* seems to be *pañcāśima*, 'fiftieth', SP 351.1 (vs). Analogical to such forms in (*-i*)*-ma* are *śatima*, '100th', and *sahasrima*, '1000th' (both Pali; Dict.).

Nominative forms with other cases, and in composition

19.37. Whitney 486c notes the use of *pañca*, *sapta*, *śatam*, *sahasram* with nouns in any case. Renou, Gr. scte. p. 385, cites nom. forms of numerals in *-ti* sporadically used with other cases (e. g. *ṣaṭṣaṣṭir gāḥ*, ĀpŚS). Since this usage is hardly normal Skt., I cite a few similar cases in our dialect: *aśītis tālān uccaistvena* LV 278.13 (prose), '80 tal-trees in height'. — *viṃśatiḥ kalpakoṭyo* (adverbial acc. of time) Samādh 8.16 (prose), 'for 20 crores of kalpas', and: *viṃśatiś ca buddhakoṭīr ārāgayām āsa*, ib., 'and propitiated 20 crores of Buddhas'; *kalpāna koṭyaḥ paripūrṇa viṃśatir* 8.29 (vs; so 2 mss., text *viṃśati*), 'for 20 full crores of kalpas'. — *ṣaṣṭiś ca kalpān* Suv 44.6 (vs); *viṃśatir gajān* 188.3, 6, 10 (prose; v.l., to be sure, *viṃśati* each time; but Nobel reads °*tir*, and I think rightly).

19.38. Such nom. forms in *-tir* are even used as prior members of cpds., probably in analogy with cpd. numerals like *trayo-daśa*, *trayastriṃśat* (cf. also *śatam* and *sahasram* used in comp., Wackernagel II.1 p. 47): *aśītir-yojanāvṛtaṃ* LV 280.16 (vs; read so, or °*āyataṃ*, with mss., for the unmetrical °*āvṛttaṃ* of Lefm.). Less clear is the construction in LV 413.3 (prose), *vipulo vistīrṇaḥ saptayojana-śatāny-āyāmo* (so Lefm.) *vistāreṇa*. If this text is correct, *-śatāny* is compounded with *-āyāmo*: 'immense, extensive, having a length of 700 yojanas in extent'. But several good mss. read *āyāma-*(*vistāreṇa*); with this reading *-śatāny* would be a separate word, '700 yojanas in length and breadth'. Since *āyāma* 'length' is often contrasted with *vistāra* 'breadth', this seems likely to be right. Cf. *aśītir-yojanāny āyāmena vistāreṇa* LV 307.14 (prose), which seems to mean 'eighty yojanas in length and breadth'; here *aśītir* may be either nom. of a separate word, or compounded with *yojanāni*; but *yojanāni* seems clearly not compounded with *āyāmena*.

20. Personal pronouns

Stem in composition

20.1. Once, in LV 364.10 (vs), occurs either *tvā-* or *tvāṃ-* (so the mss. that have the syllable) compounded with *-praṇidhī*; for so obviously we must interpret the text, tho Lefm. prints *tvā* as separate word. An extension of the use of *tvā-dṛś* etc.?

20.2. More curious is *tvaṃ-*, *tvam-* in composition: *tvaṃsādṛśakehi* SP 31.11 (vs) 'like thee'; *tvamīdṛśair* LV 325.13 (vs) 'with (beings) like thee'. Is this analogically based on *aham*, used rather freely in Skt. as prior member of compounds? (Wackernagel III p. 437, cf. 456).

20.3. Purely phonetic is the occasional loss of the final *-t* of the regular Skt. 'stems' *mat-*, *asmat-*: *asmamatena* (for *asman-m°*) LV 338.13 (vs). — *mu-dharmaṃ* (ms.) RP 17.15 (vs), Finot em. *ma-dh°* (for *mad-dh°*); it is said that the Chinese supports this in meaning; cf. § 20.56.

20.4. The 'stem' in *-t*, *-d* is once analogically affixed (before the suffix *-īya*) to *ātma-*, forming an adjective *ātmadīya*, '(one's) own', on the model of *asmadīya*, *yuṣmadīya*, etc. (Dict.).

20.5. We shall present the forms noted in the usual order of cases, first singular and then plural. Under each case we shall cite first all 1st person forms noted, then all 2d person forms.

Nominative singular

20.6. First person. Only phonetic variants of *aham* have been noted in the 1st person, viz. *ham*, *haṃ*, *ahu*, *aha*, *hu*, *ha*; all in verses only, not in prose. Pischel 417 records *haṃ* in Pkt. only after final vowels; in our texts it is also recorded several times after anusvāra. Both (*a*)*ha* and (*a*)*hu* show phonetic results of final *-am* which are common in our dialect; they are not recorded in Pischel (cf. Ap. *hau* from **ahakam*).

20.7. *haṃ*, *ham*: after vowels, *imena haṃ* SP 28.3; *em eva haṃ* (with most mss. and WT) SP 89.11; *ca haṃ* SP 324.5; *śirī ham* Mv ii.57.2; *va* (= *vā*) *ham* Gv 489.10.

After anusvāra: *teṣāṃ haṃ* Mv i.10.7 (so with 3 mss.; Senart with 3 mss. *teṣām ahaṃ*, metrically poor); *dārikāṃ ham* Gv 413.23; *campāyāṃ haṃ samutpannaḥ* Laṅk 364.15.

ahu, common: SP 11.13; 62.15; 92.12; 97.5; 99.5; 324.4; LV 78.7; 79.21; 119.5; 327.15 *tāv'* (= *tāvat*) *ahu*; 393.9; Suv 52.6; RP 27.5, 18; Bhad 1, 4, 6^2, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 33, 41, 59, 60.

aha, not common, much rarer than *ahu*; sometimes as v.l. of mss. where edd. have *ahu*, above: *ahu* LV 78.9, so ed. without ms. support; read *aha* with ms. A; others *ahaṃ*, unmetr. Here may also be counted such cases as *dade 'ha dānaṃ* Mv iii.46.14 (so divide; probably *'ha* does not represent *iha*, cf. *tarpaye 'haṃ* in next line); *sthitvāha* Suv 248.13; *māha* Sukh 22.5.

hu, after final *-a*; may also be considered examples of *ahu* with elision of preceding final *-a*: *putrāṇa hu* (v.l. *ha*) SP 90.9; *yena hu* SP 195.5; *caramāṇa hu* (= *°māṇo 'haṃ*) RP 26.7.

ha (cf. under *aha*, above), after vowels: *yānāni ha saṃpradāsye* SP 88.10; *bodhāv upāyena ha* (WT with v.l. and Tib. *°yen' iha*) *sarvi nemi* SP 195.4.

20.8. Second person. This is more varied. Besides *tva*, m.c. for *tvam* (rare: *sa tva mañjuśiri pṛccha sūdhana* Gv 488.23, 'do thou, O Sudhana, ask Mañjuśrī'; ed. prints *sattvamañjuśiri*, one word), we find: (1) *tuvaṃ*, a form well known in Pali, and authorized by grammarians (but not known to Pischel, 420, from literature) in Prakrit; this is fairly common in Mv, prose as well as verse; also its m.c. equivalent *tuva*; (2) *tumaṃ*, the regular Prakrit form (Pischel 421), or its m.c. equivalent *tuma*; but these are very rare; (3) *tuhaṃ* (modelled on *aham*), only once, SP 67.11 (vs); Pischel 421 records it only for Ḍhakkī; eastern Pkt. grammarians attribute it to Ap., see Jacobi, San. p. xxv, and cf. Alsdorf, Kum. p. 59 (it is written in Kum. 5 times instead of regular *tuhū*); (4) *tvayi*, thrice as nom. in the same context of LV; cf. Ap. *taī*, *paī*, acc. as well as inst. (so also *tvayi* in BHS) and loc., and as nom. according to Pingala 1.5b (ap. Pischel 421); any acc. is likely to be used as nom. in MIndic; (5) *tvayā*, apparently once as nom., probably by analogy with the preceding which serves also as inst. in BHS as well as in Ap., hence inst. *tvayā* also as (acc. =) nom. In the Pkt. of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan (Burrow, § 51), 'the inst. tends to be confused with the nom.' (which = acc.), even with nouns.

20.9. *tuvaṃ*, in verses: Mv i.180.18; 243.1; 305.10; ii.39.4 ff. (repeatedly); 52.18; 54.2; 71.13; 92.9; 226.11; 229.4; 235.12; 397.4, 21; iii.3.5, 7, 17; 4.2; 120.7; 295.3. And in prose: Mv i.233.10; 302.6; 343.9; 364.14; ii.70.3; 216.4; 400.13 (note here *tvaṃ pi* and *tuvaṃ pi* in the same prose line); 427.4 f.; 428.2; 448.18; 480.4, 9; 493.10; iii.151.6; 404.11.

tuva, only m.c. in verses: SP 93.9; LV 343.2.

tumaṃ, probably in Mv i.43.13 (vs), mss. cited as *buddhottamāṃ*, Senart em. *buddho tuvaṃ* (with the repetition i.243.1); but it is likely that *buddho tumaṃ* was intended.

tuma, m.c. for *tumaṃ*, in verses: LV 165.13 and ff., repeatedly; 168.15; Samādh p. 45 line 19.

tuhaṃ, see above.

tvayi (all vss of LV) *laghu tvayi narapati vibhajahi amṛtaṃ* 165.8, 'quickly do thou, Lord of Men, deal out nectar'; *tvaji tvayi . . . dhanamaṇikanakā* 165.9, 'thou hast given away . . .'; *syamu puna ṛṣisutu tvayi puri yad abhū* 166.3, 'when, again, of old thou wast the ṛṣi's son Śyāma'.

tvayā: *tvayā* (2 mss. *tayā*; Nobel em. *tuvaṃ*) *hi prahlādakarī hitaṃkarī* Suv 245.5 (vs). There can be no doubt of the meaning, nor, in my opinion, any serious doubt of the reading.

20.10. [According to Lefmann's text in LV 253.8, *tvāṃ*, the Skt. acc., would be used as nom.: *kaiṣā ati tvāṃ karuṇaṃ rudāsi*. Some mss. and Calc. read *kaiṣātīva karuṇaṃ rudate*, which is unmetrical. But Tib. supports a 3 pers. verb, with no 2 pers. subject. A reasonable and metrically correct reading would be *kaiṣā atīvā karuṇaṃ rudāti*, or the like; and it seems improbable that there was any 2 pers. pronoun here.]

Accusative singular

20.11. First person. The only non-Skt. forms clearly established are original genitives (datives) — *mama*, *mahyam*, *me*, and phonetic variants of these — used as

accusatives. Pkt. (and occasionally even Skt., Wackernagel III p. 473) uses the enclitic *me* as acc.; both Pali and Pkt. have *mamaṃ*, a sort of blend of *mama* and *māṃ*. (Pischel 418 notes Mg. *mama* in verse, Mṛcch. Stenzler 129.4; he would read *mamā*.) In our dialect, however, *mamaṃ* (except as emendation by editors) has been noted only in *mamaṃ ca*, reading of WT with ms. K′ for *mamaiva* SP 325.4 (vs; both acc. sg. and equally acceptable). It may be guessed that *me* came first to be used for acc. as well as dat.-gen. (perhaps by analogy with *no*, *vo* = *nas*, *vas*, for all three cases); and that *mama* and *mahyam* then followed the analogy of *me*.

20.12. *mama*: *mama dṛṣṭva* (so read with v.l. for Lefm. *dṛṣṭi*) *sapāriṣadyaṃ* LV 304.15 (vs).—Mv prose: *mama . . . adhyabhāṣeran* Mv i.56.13, 'addressed me'; *yadi mama bhāryām upādiyasi* 233.7, 'if you take me as your wife'; *mama evābhikāṅkṣati* ii.69.9 (repeated 72.13; cf. *bodhisattvam evābhi*° 69.3, 5); *mama patiṃ varehi* 70.4, 10, 'choose me as husband'; *mama gṛhṇāhi* 70.8; others, iii.174.9; 265.8 (here Senart em. *mamaṃ*); 291.10; *mama uddiśya āgato* 351.9 'came back (with reference) to me'; verses i.143.5 (Senart em. *māṃ*, without metrical or other good reason); ii.71.5, 11, 19; 194.4. — *mā tāvan mamāpīcchasi ghātayitum* Divy 380.11 (prose), 'you don't want to kill me too, do you?' (but cf. § 7.72). — *mamāgamya* Av i.321.13; ii.96.8 (both prose) 'thanks to me'; in both Speyer em. *māṃ āgamya*.

mamā, m.c. for *mama*, in verses: *mamā hi paśyet* SP 237.14. No v.l. given by KN; WT em. *mamaṃ* (their ms. K′ reads *mama*); *yasmin mama* (meter requires long final; doubtless read *mamā*) *praṇayase tvam ihādya amba* LV 119.4, 'to whom you, O mother, are conducting me here today'.

mahyam (?): *haneyu mahyaṃ* LV 232.1 (vs), 'they might kill me'. Perhaps gen.; see § 7.72.

20.13. *me*: Mv prose: *adrākṣīt me* Mv i.56.10 (with acc. sg. *āgacchantaṃ* in agreement); *mahāprabhāvaṃ* (or other adjectives in repetitions) *vata me samānaṃ mā haiva me śramaṇo gautamo abhibhaviṣyatīti* ii.277.2 ff. (Māra speaks); 428.2; *śāpena me saparivāraṃ bhasmīkareya* iii.158.6; 169.8; 180.11; 291.14; verses: *tvayā ca me pravāreyā* ii.88.11, so read (compare readings of mss. with the Pali Jāt. iii.284.4), 'he would gratify me with you' (the rest of the line is troublesome but for Senart's *prattaṃ* read certainly *yaṃ ca* [Mv mss. *paṃca*]; after it possibly *cayitaṃ*); *mā ca viprajāhi me* 142.18; 319.14; 484.5; iii.3.16; cf. Mv ii.119.2–3, § 7.69.

Weller 47 alleges two cases of *me* acc. in LV prose, but neither is convincing. In 396.1 *me* is dative: *ahaṃ ced idaṃ dharmaṃ deśayeyaṃ pare ca me na vibhāvayeyuḥ*, 'if I taught this dharma, the rest would not understand (it) at my hands'. In 404.11 ed. *me ha*, but read *meha* = *mā-iha*.

mi, m.c. for *me* (cf. *ti* for *te*): so doubtless read (or *mĕ*? § 3.64) for text *me* in Mv iii.366.17; meter requires *mi* as much as *ti* in line 15 (the question to which 17 is a response). In line 18 *me* also acc., but here meter is correct.

20.14. Second person. We find *tava*, *tubhyam*, and *te* (*ti*), gen.-dat. forms, corresponding to the 1st person forms. But here we also find *tvaṃ*, *tuvaṃ*, and even (before vowels) *tvam*; the first two may be regarded as having MIndic short *a* for *ā* in closed syllable; in the last this shortening may be due to metrical requirements, or it may be simply the nom. form used as acc.

20.15. *tvaṃ*, before consonants: Mv i.175.14 and 15; iii.386.19 (all vss). In all Senart emends *tvaṃ* to *tvāṃ*.

tvam, before vowels: *ahaṃ tvam adhyeṣāmi* SP 38.2 (vs); *tvam u gṛhyā* LV 169.10 (vs).

tuvaṃ: *upādiyāmi* (? mss. corrupt) *tuvaṃ* (so mss.; Senart em. *tava*, perhaps because of 234.8 *upādiyāmi tava adya bhāryaraṃ*) *bhāryāṃ* (mss. *bhāryā*, which may be kept) Mv i.233.11 (prose), 'I take thee as my wife'; Mv iii.122.2 (vs).

20.16. *tava*: Mv prose: *tava āgamya* Mv i.365.12, 'thanks to you'; *nāhaṃ tava patiṃ iccheya* ii.70.6; *edṛśaṃ tava pūrvopakārim* 180.1, 'such (as) you, a former benefactor'; *tava . . . draṣṭuṃ* 427.7; and verse: *upādiyāmi tava adya bhāryaraṃ* i.234.8 (so read with v.l., see § 9.25), 'I take thee today as wife'.

tubhyaṃ: LV (all verses): *sarve tubhyaṃ pūjya śresthāṃ karonti* 195.10 (so divide), 'all, having honored you, make you (into) a noble person' (so Tib. clearly: kun gyis khyod mchod gtso mor byed par ḥgyur); but cf. § 7.69; *te tubhyaṃ na samartha bodhiviṭapāc cāletu kampetu vā* 283.21; similarly 360.18.

tubhya, m.c. for prec.: *tubhya prekṣami śayāni suptikāṃ* LV 236.3 (vs), 'I look on thee asleep on the couch'.

te: LV (all verses): *jayāmi te* LV 262.13; *chinadmi te* 338.14; *vandima te* 364.6; *śirasā vandima te tathāgataṃ* 364.19 and 365.5 (note acc. noun agreeing with *te*).—Mv (prose): *vayaṃ te . . . saṃmanyema* i.348.2 (cf. 347.18 *taṃ saṃmanyemaḥ*); *ahaṃ te neṣyāmi* (in 4 *nemi*) ii.249.1 and 4; *te . . . nihaniṣyāmi* 270.2 ff. (repeatedly; cf. § 7.72); iii.169.7, 8; and verses: *te vande śāntaṃ te dāntaṃ* i.98.7; ii.484.2; iii.452.11.

ti, m.c. for prec.: Mv iii.366.15 (vs).

Instrumental singular

20.17. First person. Besides *maya* in verses m.c. for *mayā*, we find, first, *maye*, which corresponds to regular Pkt. *mae*; it has been noted only in Mv, but is not rare there. Then *mayi* (also as acc.), as in Ap. (*maĩ*, *mai*; also Mg. *mai*, verse, Pischel 418). Also *me* as occasionally in Skt. (Wackernagel III p. 473), and more often in Pali and Pkt. (also m.c. *mi*); and (presumably by analogy with *me*) *mahyam*.

20.18. *maya*, in verses, m.c. for *mayā*: LV 373.3, 10; 393.10, 11; Mv ii.55.16; 245.4 (so read with v.l., as required by meter; Senart *maye*); Gv 255.18 (read *sa maya* for *samaya*).

maye, only in Mv, but the following examples all from prose except ii.320.8, and all without v.l.: i.37.6; 60.13; 243.6; 286.18, 19, 20, 21; 288.8, 9, 11; 290.5, 6; 363.14; 365.3; ii.77.2, 3; 82.5; 241.11; 255.9; 257.3; 320.8 (vs); 420.3; iii.144.5.

mayi, noted only in verses (rare in Mv): *mayi pūrva tyakta* LV 210.15; *mayi . . . dānu damo . . . sucīrṇā* LV 287.5; *mayi bho kṛtābhyanujñā* Mv i.151.13, 'having permission granted by me'; *mayi tyakta-m-aṅguli udārā* RP 24.1; Bhad 8, 12, 61; Dbh.g. 11(347).18, read *mayi* with Susa's mss. (cited in note as *mapi*), for text *me*; *pūjā kṛtā mayi jinasyo* Gv 255.22.

20.19. *me*: *na me śrutā vā dṛṣṭā vā sūcī etādṛśā* (mss. °*śī*, °*śaṃ*) *mayā* Mv ii.88.17 (vs; note repetition of *me* by *mayā*); *na me svayaṃ dṛṣṭo . . .* 110.12 (prose; response to question *kiṃ tvayā svayaṃ dṛṣṭo . . .*) 'I did not see him myself'; *me . . . agāram adhyāvasatā* iii.214.15 (prose; note inst. agreeing with *me*). — *ajānantena me* Suv 27.15 (vs). — *nṛpeṇa satā me* RP 22.12 (vs); *caratā me* 23.8 (vs); and others in this context. — *me . . . āyūhatā niryūhatā* etc. (inst. forms with *me*) Gv 69.23 ff. (prose).

mi, m.c. for prec.: *mi bodhi prāptā* Suv 153.16 (vs).

mahyaṃ: *pūrve mahyaṃ dānu dattaṃ*, 'in former time by me charity was given' LV 196.5 (vs); Tib. ṅas, inst.; *niryātitā . . . mahyam* Suv 146.2 (vs) (Tib. ṅas); *mahyaṃ . . . tyaktam* Suv 146.4 (vs).

20.20. Second person. Here all the preceding 1st person forms are paralleled: *tvaya* (m.c.); *tvaye* (but this is very rare); *tvayi* (also *tvayī*); *te* (and m.c. *ti*, also *ty-* before vowel); and *tubhyam* (or m.c. *tubhya*). In addition,

the form *tvam* seems to be used as inst., as also as gen. (see below); tho both hardly occur except in one passage of LV, and there before the word *iha*, which raises a suspicion. Are we dealing with an obscure nonce creation of a single author, perhaps involving peculiar phonology (saṃdhi?)?

20.21. *tvaya*, m.c., verses: LV 178.19; 243.7; Mv ii.140.7.

tvaye: Mv iii.32.15 (vs).

tvayi (not noted in Mv; only vss): *kṛta tvayi hitakara bahuguṇa* LV 165.1; 166.1, 9 (read in 9 *hitavata*, for °*tā*, § 18.84); 167.20; *tvayi caratā* 168.5; (168.6, see § 20.23;) 168.11; 169.17; 178.3, 7.

tvayī, for prec.: *bhotu me laghu samāgamas tvayī* Gv 489.14, 'coming together with thee'. At the end of a rathoddhatā line; can hardly be called m.c., since in the same passage other lines are allowed to end in a short vowel.

20.22. *te*: LV, no quite certain cases in prose: *te* . . . *-darśanaviśeṣaḥ sākṣātkṛtaḥ* 409.4 (prose) is cited by Weller 47, but as Pischel observes 421, *te* depending on such participles may be considered gen. The same could be said of some of my examples following:—Verses: LV 169.11; 171.9, 11; *kṣipta harṣitena te* 171.16; 195.9 ff. (*te* 9 times); *yaṣṭās te caratā* . . . 284.2; *tyaktā* (v. l. °*tās*) *te* . . . *caratā* 361.2. — *mṛgabhūtena te* Mv i.365.11 (prose), 'by you who are a deer'; *mama te jīvitaṃ dattaṃ sarvaṃ te* (so mss., Senart em. *me*) *rājyaṃ saṃśayāto mocitaṃ* ii.491.3–4, 'you have given me life; you have freed (my) whole kingdom from risk.' — *te pralobhyamānena* . . . *notpādayitavyā* Divy 115.8 (prose).

ti, and before vowel *ty*, m.c. for prec.: *nihatā ti mārakarmā* LV 12.10 (Tib. khyod kyis, 'by thee'); *ti* . . . *kurvatā* 172.15–16; *ti* 172.19 and 20; 184.1; *yaṃ ty upasthitu jage hitaṃkaro* 237.15, 'in that the one who works weal in the world has been respectfully approached by thee'.

tubhyaṃ: *buddhaśatasahasra saṃpūjitā pūrvi tubhyaṃ mune* LV 365.13 (vs), 'hundreds of thousands of Buddhas have been honored by thee of old, O sage.'

tubhya, in vss, m.c. for prec.: LV 53.1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13; 170.7; *tubhya śiṣyamāṇā* 184.6, 'taught by thee'.

20.23. *tvam* (see § 20.20); only vss: *kṛtu svaguṇo tvam ihā jagato 'rthe dhyānaratenā* LV 169.7, 'by thee thine own quality was made (perfected) for the sake of the world here, by thee delighting in meditation'; *hatatamasa* (read °*sā* with v.l., m.c.) *tvam ihā kṛtu loke arthu mahanto* 169.20; in 168.6 Lefm. with most mss. *kṛtu tvam ihā* (mss. *iha*) . . . *śīlaratena* (Lefm. em. °*nā*!); certainly an inst. is meant; but ms. A *tvayi* for *tvam ihā*. Since all mss. are corrupt (and metrically imperfect), the true reading remains conjectural.

Dative singular

20.24. In LV 232.6 (vs) *tvaya*(-*m*) may be taken as dat., or possibly loc.: *premeṇa mahyaṃ tvaya-m-api vartiṣyante*, 'they will behave with love towards you also (as) towards me.' The -*m*- is presumably 'hiatus-bridger'. In Skt. *vṛt-* in this sense regularly takes a loc., but also dat. or acc.; *mahyaṃ* here points to a dat. Since *tubhyaṃ* and *mahyaṃ* may be used as inst. (and in our language as in Ap. acc., inst., and loc. of personal pronouns seem confused—indeed it would hardly be going too far to say that all cases are confused), it is perhaps not rash to permit Skt. *tvayā* (in a form altered m.c.) to pass as dat.

Ablative singular

20.25. [In a line of verse repeated four times Mv ii.148.18; 149.2, 6, 14, Senart assumes *mamātu* = Pkt. *mamāo*, abl. sg. But a gen., not abl., is needed here. Probably read *mamā* (= *mama*, m.c.) *tu ratir na bhavet*, 'but I should find no pleasure'. In 149.14 one ms. reads *mamātra*; if this reading were adopted the sense would be, 'I should find no pleasure therein (*atra*)'.] With unlengthened -*a* before -*to*: *mamato* Mv ii.272.7 (prose; one ms. *mama*); so Aśokan *mamate* (Hultzsch cvi).

Genitive singular

20.26. The use of dative forms as genitives is not only standard MIndic, but occurs often enough in some Skt. texts (especially epic; cf. Wackernagel III p. 460). In our dialect it is very common, particularly in the personal pronouns, and hardly needs extensive illustration; but we shall cite a few examples of *mahyam* and *tubhyam* which show this construction very clearly.

20.27. First person. Otherwise, we find *mahya* for *mahyam* (I have noted it only in verses, but doubt whether it can be called strictly 'm.c.', since it occurs in some situations where *mahyaṃ* would be as good metrically); *mamā* and *mi*, which occur only or chiefly m.c. for *mama* (tho *mamā* occurs in mss. Mv i.362.12, prose, and in Aśoka's inscriptions, both Kalsi and Dhauli-Jaugada, Hultzsch lxxviii and cvi) and *me* respectively; and—barely possibly, but very rarely if at all—*mamaṃ*, on which see below.

20.28. *mahyaṃ* (see also *mahya*, below) as gen.: *mahyaṃ bhāṣato* LV 78.4 (vs); *jātasya mahyam* (gen. abs.) 118.21 (vs). — *mahyaṃ rahogatasya* Mv i.51.8 (prose); *mahyaṃ pitā* 178.17 (vs), 'my father'; *pṛṣṭhato mahyaṃ* ii.104.17 (vs), 'after me'.

mahya (only in vss, but not invariably demanded, instead of *mahyam*, by meter): *mahya imasmi* SP 25.15 (note that *mahyam* would be quite as good metrically); 61.7; 62.1; 86.8; *mahya* . . . *aputrakasya* 87.4; *mahya ime* 93.9; 197.6; 203.4; 237.1 (metr. indifferent). — *mahya* LV 159.8; (mss. *mahyaṃ*, Lefm. em. m.c.) . . . *āśritasya* 189.7. — Mv i.186.7; 277.12 = 279.21 = 281.19; ii.39.21; 40.1, 3; 56.3, 5; 61.11; 133.19; 204.17; 226.16; iii.122.13. — Suv 51.5; 249.7. — *mahyedaṃ vacanam* Mmk 104.24.

20.29. *mamā*: SP 97.4; 55.8 and 220.9, in both of which *mamā* must be read with Nep. mss. and WT, against KN with Kashgar rec. *mama* (unmetrical); LV 42.17; 119.8; Mv i.48.9, Senart prints *mamā* at the end of a line, without report of v.l.; the repetition i.82.5 reads *mayā*, and inst. seems better than gen.; is *mamā* at i.48.9 a mere misprint? See also under *mamaṃ* below.—Suv 52.2; Gv 54.2; 214.17, etc.

mi, only in vss m.c.: SP 34.8; 35.8; 63.3; 64.5; 152.3; 236.7. — LV 38.10; *sā mi kuruta* 79.22 (ed.) or (ms. A) *sā ca kuru mi*: 132.14; 189.6; 195.3. — Mv ii.5.9 (in parallel i.201.14 mss. *me*, unmetr.; Senart emends another word); ii.140.12. — Sukh 22.3, 7, 11.

20.30. *mamaṃ*? Tho this is familiar in Pkt. beside *mama*, it can hardly be said certainly to occur in our texts. In Mv i.48.7 and 223.16 Senart introduces *mamaṃ*, m.c., but the mss. have *mama*, and a better em. would be *mamā*. On the other hand, in Mv ii.273.4 (prose) Senart reads *mama tti*, where the mss. seem to point to *mamaṃ ti* (*mamanti*), at least as a possibly original reading. I have not recorded another; nor is *mamaṃ* established as acc. in our dialect.

20.31. Second person. Here we find *tubhyam* and *tubhya*, *tavā*, and *ti* (*ty*) corresponding to *mahya*(*m*), *mamā*, and *mi*. We also find, in Mv only, *tuhyam* and *tuhya* (cf. Pali *tuyhaṃ*, and similar forms in Pkt.), analogical to *mahya*(*m*). Further, there is one probable case of *tuma* (analogical to *mama*; cited only by grammarians for Pkt., but cf. AMg. *tumaṃ*, Pischel 420 f.); and several apparent cases of *tvam* as gen. (cf. *tvam* as inst.; mostly in the same LV context as the latter, but once *tvaṃ* in Mv according to the mss.).

20.32. *tubhyam*, *tubhyaṃ*: *tubhyam antike* SP 212.7 (vs), 'in thy presence'; LV 169.4; 189.1 (both vss).

tubhya, only vss, but not always m.c.: SP 274.6; *tubhya* (WT with K′ *tava*) *eṣa* LV 221.20 (not m.c.); LV 223.1; 367.17; Mv i.156.20; *tubhya asti* Mv ii.321.3 (not m.c.).

tuhyaṃ, only in Mv: i.226.4 = ii.29.7 (in the latter v.l. *tubhyaṃ*); ii.4.11 (v.l. *tubhyaṃ*) = i.200.14, where Senart em. *tubhyaṃ*, read *tuhyaṃ* (mss. *bhujyaṃ*, *guhyaṃ*); i.252.1; 277.9; 326.10 (prose; v.l. *tuhya*; before *eva*, but *tuhyaṃ*, not °*yam*); ii.92.22; 105.9; iii.45 12; 346.5; 451.11 (twice; v.l. *tuhye*, *tuhya*).

tuhya (cf. under *tuhyaṃ*; chiefly m.c.), only in Mv vss: i.166.5; 255.20; *tuhyānukampāya* ii.52.20 (= Jāt. v. 391.20 *tav' eva atthāya*); 57.4, 20; 60.1; 184.13 (mss. *tujya*; *jya* and *hya* are hardly distinguished, Senart i p. xii); 221.10; 229.16; 238.8; iii.124.18; 136.15, 17.

20.33. *tavā*, m.c. for *tava*: LV 168.18; 175.14, 18; 211.5.

ti, probably only in vss, m.c. for *te*: *vayaṃ ti* SP 270.4, so Kashgar rec., confirmed Lüders ap. Hoernle MR 158 (KN and WT *vayaṃ pi* with Nep. mss.); *vayaṃ ti sūtraṃ* 271.7 with Kashgar rec., confirmed La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1076 (KN *vayaṃ tadā te*); in 271.8 read with La Vallée Poussin l. c. *subhairave* (ms. *subheravi*) *kāli kṣayāt ti*, partially with Kashgar rec. in KN note. — In LV 76.6, read *kīdṛśaṃ ti kāyi saukhya*, 'what sort of joy is in thy body?'; 164.4, read *śīlenā na ti sadṛśu*; 167.15; 168.18; 170.9, 12, 18; 243.2; 285.15; 362.13; 416.7. — In Mv prose i.45.1 Senart assumes *siyā ti*; but read *siyāti*, 3 sg. opt. In Mv vss; *ti* i.145.17 = ii.6.11 (in another repetition i.202.14 *te*, or actually *tre*, is read); i.155.14; 156.12; 202.2 = ii.5.18; i.233.18. — *rūpaṃ ti* (1st ed. printed *rūpanti*) Gv 253.22.

ty, m.c.: *sarve ty abhinandante* LV 12.9 (vs), 'all desire for thee (on thy behalf)'.

20.34. *tuma*: this is probably to be read LV 53.8 (vs): *maitracitta tuma devamānuṣāḥ*, 'gods and men (have become) friendly-hearted towards you.' Lefm.'s best ms. A reads *tumā* (meter requires short final); the other mss. and Calc. unmetrically *bhūta*; Lefm. em. *bhuta*.

20.35. *tvam*: *ayu samayo tvam ihā narasiṃhā niṣkramaṇāya* LV 168.22, 'this is the time for thee, Man-lion, here to depart from the world'; *ayu samayo tvam ihā varasattvā* (voc.) *dhyānavikurvā* (voc.) 169.8; *ayu samayo tvam ihā nṛpasūno* (so read with v.l.) *niṣkramaṇāya* 169.16; *ayu samayo tvam ihā varabuddhe niṣkramaṇāya* 170.2 (all examples vss.)—The usage seems confirmed by Mv i. 174.12 (vs) where mss. *tvaṃ* (two out of six *taṃ*; Senart em. *te*) *prathame phale.*

Locative singular

20.36. First person. *haṃmi*, or *ahaṃmi*, seems to be the true reading Mv iii.216.7 (vs) *tato haṃmi prādur ahi* (so read with mss., § 32.28), 'then before me appeared'. There is a v.l. *haṃ pi*, which makes no possible sense. Senart is right in assuming a loc. and comparing the grammatically authorized Pkt. forms *amhammi*, *mahammi* (Pischel 415).

Nominative plural

20.37. First person. *vaya* and *vayu* occur as phonetic reductions of *vayam*, in verses m.c. Only once I have noted *asme* (= Pkt. *amhe*), and once *asmo* by em. (cf. Pkt. *amho*, cited in grammarians, Pischel 415). About equally rare, and not too certain, are cases of *no*, *mo*, and *me*, which will be discussed below.

20.38. *vaya* (m.c.): SP 117.5; LV 133.9.

vayu (m.c.): LV 368.21 (Lefm. with most mss.; ms. A *vaya*).

asme: SP 272.4 (vs), so KN with Kashgar rec., confirmed by La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1076 *asmai*.

asmo: LV 115.15 (vs); mss. *asmi*, *asmin*, *asmiṃ*, but the em. *asmo* seems fairly plausible.

20.39. *no*: Divy 200.16 (prose) *yan no dharmaśravaṇābhiratā bhaviṣyāma ity*. Note attributes this form to Pali (from Childers). It is not recorded in Geiger (nor in Pischel for Pkt.). But the Saddanīti (xii.51; Smith I p. 295 line 20 ff., 296.1–3) does indeed authorize it as nom. pl.; this is the ultimate source of Childers's citation.

20.40. *mo*: Hemacandra iii.106 recognizes this as nom. pl. It occurs in our language oftener as acc. and gen. pl. (§§ 20.47, 58; Senart i note p. 601). But it seems quite clearly nom. pl. in Mv iii.9.10 = 10.1 (vs) *iha mo tamasaṃgrahe vasāmo andhakārake* (10.1 *saṃvasāmo 'ndha*°). Noteworthy in this connexion is the form *mu*, evidently a MIndic shortening of *mo*, as gen. pl. in the 'Prakrit Dhammapada', Senart JA IX.12 (1898).293. Cf. next.

20.41. *me*: *tato me etāhi strīhi uddhṛtā* Mv iii.72.8 (prose), mss. Senart emends *me* to *maṃ*; if any emendation were to be made, *mo* would be more plausible (cf. prec.). But perhaps *me* may stand; cf. Pkt. *ṇe* beside *ṇo* as acc. pl. (*me* would be to *mo*, above, as *ṇe* to *ṇo*). Cf. Aśokan *ve*, nom. pl. (see below under *vo*, *vaḥ*, nom. pl.).

20.42. Second person. Besides *yūya* m.c. for *yūyaṃ*, we find *yuṣme*, = Vedic id. (and cf. Pali-Pkt. *tumhe*, which presupposes it); as well as *yuṣmi*, m.c. for this (and possibly *yuṣma*? see LV 314.15, below). The regular Pali-Pkt. form, written *tumhe*, occurs a few times in the text of Mv, always with a v.l. *tuṣphe* (once written *tuḥse*), which (if the true reading) recalls Aśokan *tuphe* (Dhauli-Jaugada and Pillar Edicts), nom.-acc. pl. (Hultzsch cvi, cxviii). We also find *vo* as nom. pl.; cf. Aśokan (Maski) *ve* (Hultzsch cxxvii), nom. pl., and *no*, *mo*, above. (In fact *ve* occurs once here as a v.l. for *vo*, nom. pl.) Twice a v.l. *vā* occurs for *vo*, and, doubtless by analogy with *vo*, there is also *yuṣmākam* as nom. (as well as acc.) pl.

20.43. *yūya*, in vss, m.c.: SP 91.9, 11, 12.

yuṣme (not limited to verses; prose marked): SP 45.12; 378.2 (prose, so read with Kashgar rec. for *yūyam*). — LV 152.1. — Mv i.186.8; 313.8, 9 (both prose); ii.54.21; iii.85.19. — Śikṣ 354.7. — KP 146.1 (prose), twice.

yuṣmi, in vss, m.c. for prec.: SP 195.3, Kashgar rec. *yuṣmi sarve* for text *sarvi yūyam*. — LV 314.16.

yuṣma? Cf. *asma*, acc. pl. Pischel 420 quotes *tumha* as given by grammarians only; it may possibly occur in Ap. (Jacobi, Bhav 37*). The only possible occurrence I have noted is *yuṣmaiva* LV 314.15 (vs), nom. pl., if it stands for *yuṣma* plus *eva*; but perhaps *yuṣme-eva* would yield the same result.

tumhe: occurs in text, with one ms. (out of two used), Mv ii.173.14; 174.4; iii.73.9 (all prose), and ii.184.15 (vs). In the last three there is a v.l. *tuṣphe*, in the first *tuḥse*, probably intending the same or *tuḥphe*.

20.44. *vo* (once v.l. *ve*, cf. above): *yena vo* (mss. *vaḥ*, *vā*) *tīram ānītā* Mv iii.78.17 (vs), 'since you have been brought to the shore'; *taṃ vo upetha śaraṇam* 85.18 (vs), 'go ye to him for refuge' (here one ms. *ve*, cf. above); *kiṃ vo āgatā* 91.16 (prose), 'why have you come?' (one ms. *vā āgatā*, the other *vo āgato*). This usage is found even in RV. according to G. Liebert, Lunds Univ. Årsskrift N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 46, Nr. 3 (1950); but he is hardly convincing.

yuṣmākam: *jīvanto yuṣmākam* (printed *yuṣyākam*) *athavā mṛtāḥ* Kv 32.4 (prose), 'are you alive or dead?'

Accusative plural

20.45. First person. The nom. *vayam* is used as acc. In a verse, *asma* occurs; cf. Pkt. (M.) *amha*, acc. (according to grammarians, also nom., cf. *yuṣma* above) pl. Erroneous is the isolated *nā*, despite *vā* above as v.l. for *vo* in nom.

pl. There is also *mo*, a modification of *no*, with the initial *m-* of the sg. (like Pali *mayaṃ* for *vayaṃ*), which we met above as nom. pl. and shall meet (more often) as gen. pl.; and also *maṃ*, which is not recorded outside of our dialect in the pl. but occurs here more often and more certainly as gen. pl.; is it a transfer to the pl. from acc. sg. (MIndic) *maṃ* (= Skt. *mām*), first as acc. pl. and then also as gen. pl. (by analogy with *no*, *mo*, etc., which are used for both these cases)? By this same analogy we also find *asmākaṃ*, the Skt. gen. pl., or *asmāka* m.c., used as acc. pl.

20.46. *vayaṃ*: *vayaṃ ca na samanvāhariṣyati* Mv iii.163.8 (prose), 'and he will not be interested in us'.

asma: *taṃ cāsma lokācariyaḥ . . . upekṣate* SP 118.1 (vs).

[*nā*: *premagauravam upasthapisva nā* (end of line) LV 54.15 (vs), could only mean 'cause us to enter into (i. e. to manifest) love and respect'; apparently all Lefm.'s mss. read *nā*; Calc. *naḥ*. However, several mss. read °*pitva* for °*pisva*, and the true text is undoubtedly *upasthapitvanā*, gerund, which makes good sense.]

20.47. *mo*: only in Mv; and some of the cases cited by Senart are emendations. The following acc. pl. cases seem reasonably reliable; gen. pl. forms are more frequent: Mv iii.84.2, 15 (vss); *na mo bhagavan rājā śuddhodano icchati draṣṭuṃ* Mv iii.102.18 (prose).

maṃ: *tā maṃ* (v.l. *tā-saṃ*) *samyak prativartanti* (probably read with one ms. *prativartetsu*) Mv iii.84.9 (vs). Note in line 15 below: *tā mo samyak prativartensu.*

20.48. *asmākaṃ*, or m.c. *asmāka*: *asmākaṃ . . . dāyādān saṃsthāpayati* SP 109.7 (prose); *asmākaṃ smārayati tathāgatajñānadāyādān* 110.4 (prose); *śrutvā ca asmāka* (m.c.; WT °*ku*; or perhaps gen.?) 116.7 (vs); *saced asmākam api bhagavān, yatheme 'nye mahāśrāvakā vyākṛtā, evam asmākam api tathāgataḥ pṛthak-pṛthag vyākuryāt* 206.6 (prose); *yad bhagavān asmākaṃ vyākuryād anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau* 215.7–8 (prose). — *nehi tvaṃ asmākaṃ* Mv ii.219.13 (prose), 'conduct thou us'; *asmākaṃ tārehi* iii.75.19 (prose), 'save us'; *asmākaṃ ca dṛṣṭvā* 102.19 (prose); *jahāsi asmākaṃ* 216.3 (prose). —? *asmākam api samanvāharethāḥ* Av i.211.2; but *samanvāharati* appears to be used elsewhere with indubitably gen. forms, see Dict.

20.49. Second person. *yūyam* (like *vayam*) may be used as acc. pl. We also find in a verse *yuṣmi*, evidently m.c. for *yuṣme*, a Vedic form which underlies the regular Pkt. *tumhe*; and *yuṣme* itself is very likely the true reading (instead of *yuṣmākaṃ*) at SP 379.3 (prose). Like *asmākam*, *yuṣmākam* is used as acc. pl. Sen 33 regards some, perhaps all, such cases as syntactic confusions (gen. instead of acc.); some of his long list are doubtless best understood thus, but it seems to me better to consider the cases listed here formal confusions, i. e. to call them accusatives.

20.50. *yūyam*: *paśyāmi yūyam . . . sarvān* SP 198.1 (vs).

yuṣmi (on *yuṣme* see next): LV 324.21 (vs).

yuṣmākaṃ: *nāham* (. . .) *yuṣmākaṃ paribhavāmi* SP 378.1, 6; 379.3; 380.1; 382.5 (all prose), 'I do not revile you'. I doubt the use of the gen. with *paribhavāmi*. In 379.3 the Kashgar rec. reads *yuṣme*, which is quite likely the true reading here (possibly in the other cases also?). — *prativartensu yathā yuṣmākaṃ* Mv iii.84.15 (vs); *jahāmi yuṣmākaṃ* (v.l. °*ka*) Mv iii.216.8 (vs). — *yuṣmākam āgamya* Divy 405.10 (prose), 'due to you'.

Instrumental plural

20.51. First person: *asmābhi* and *asmabhi* occur in verses, evidently m.c. for *asmābhis*. There is also *asmehi*, once with v.l. *aspehi*, corresponding to *amhehi* which is regular in Pali (Geiger 104) and alternative to *amhehiṃ* in Pkt. (Pischel 419); also *asmair* (*asmais*) is probably to be read once, cf. Pkt. *amhe* (gram., Pischel 415) and AMg. *tubbhe* (see below under *tusphehi*). Finally, *asmākam* is used (not only as acc. but also) as inst., at least once.

20.52. *asmābhi*, in vss m.c.: SP 117.8; 118.9, 10.

asmabhi, id.: LV 327.20 (mss. *asmabhiḥ*, unmetrical).

asmehi: *asmehi* (mss. *astehi*) *jīvantehi* Mv i.313.8 (prose), 'while we are alive' (see § 7.34 end); ii.228.10 (vs); 469.2 (prose); iii.79.2 (v.l. *aspehi*), 4 (both vss); 390.10 (prose, v.l. *ātmehi*). — Sukh 51.3 (vs).

asmair: SP 110.13 (vs), Kashgar rec. *asmair*, text with Nep. *asmābhir* (both, because of other changes, are metrically acceptable).

asmākaṃ: *tair asmākaṃ bhaktāgre raṇam utpāditam* Divy 335.24 (prose), 'we produced a fight in the refectory.' Followed by: *te vayaṃ bhaktāgre raṇam utpādayitvā iha . . . upapannāḥ.*

20.53. Second person: *tumhehi* occurs; it is the regular Pali form and occurs beside *tumhehiṃ* in Pkt. (Pischel 422); also the semi-Sanskritized equivalent *yuṣmehi*. We find also *yuṣme*; Pischel does not list **tumhe*, but he lists (from grammarians) the corresponding *amhe* (cf. *asmair* above). Cf. also AMg. *tubbhe*, which with *tubbhehiṃ* (for both see Pischel 422) and the Aśokan (Dhauli-Jaugada) *tuphehi* (Hultzsch cvi), are to be compared with our *tusphehi* or *tuspehi*. Finally we find *tubhyaṃhi*, which is the dat.-gen. form provided with an inst. ending.

20.54. *tumhehi*: Mv ii.78.2 (prose).

yuṣmehi vinītehi (as loc. abs.; cf. § 7.34) Mv i.198.15 (prose).

yuṣme: *kathaṃ punar yuṣme dharmaṃ śrutam* KP 146.4 (prose).

tusphehi, or *tuspehi*: Mv ii.2.17 (prose), Senart em. *tuphehi* (the Aśokan form, above); but mss. either *tusphehi* (so critical note at foot of page) or *tuspehi* (so note on p. 497); cf. *tuṣphe* as nom. pl., § 20.42.

tubhyaṃhi: Mv i.254.1 (prose), so mss.; Senart em. *tubhyehi*.

Ablative plural

20.55. First person. The form *asmād*, instead of *asmad*, is read 11 times in Mv ii.79.4 ff. (vss), *tasmā hi asmād daharo na mryyati*, 'therefore from among us (our family) no young person dies'. On the abl. in partitive sense, cf. Speyer VSS 56. The mss. usually read *asmākaṃ*, which is metrically impossible. The Pali parallel, Jāt. iv.53.9, has *amhaṃ*.

Genitive plural

20.56. First person. *asmāka* and *asmāku* occur in verses m.c. for *asmākam*. There is also *asma* = Pkt. *amha* (Pischel 419, in M.JM., beside the commoner *amhaṃ* which is also Pali). Not uncommon in Mv is *mo*, for which see §§ 20.40, 47, and *maṃ* (cf. § 20.47) occurs often enough to seem not open to question. Once, apparently, *nu* occurs for *no* = *nas*, in a verse, doubtless m.c.; cf. *tus* for *vas*, and the 'Pkt. Dhammapada' form *mu* (gen. pl.) for *mo* = *no* (§ 20.40). (The ms. reading *mu-* RP 17.15, see § 20.3, can hardly be right, unless it is used as sg., for which no evidence has been noted; Buddha, speaking of his own *dharma*, would hardly say 'our' for 'my'.) According to Senart *vayam* is once used as gen., but the passage is doubtful.

20.57. *asmāka*, in vss m.c.: SP 116.1, 7 (in 7 WT °*ku*); 117.2, 10; 118.2. In the last two, some or most Nep. mss. *asmāku*.

asmāku, see preceding.

asma: *asmāpi kṣetraṃ siya evarūpaṃ* Sukh 50.12 (vs), 'may we also have a field like that'.

20.58. *mo*: only in Mv; and a number of the cases listed in Senart's Index are conjectural. The following

(not all listed by Senart) seem to be reasonably reliable instances of gen. use: prose, i.351.7; 355.4; verses, i.306.15; *yathaiva mo śakra tathaiva so tuvaṃ* ii.54.2, 'just as Śakra is to us, so shall you be'; *yo mo prathamo* 70.14, 'who first of us'; 79.5, 19; iii.84.11; 86.8; 367.6.

20.59. *maṃ*: only in Mv; some cases listed in Senart's Index are conjectural and unreliable. *yo maṃ prathamataraṃ svākhyātaṃ dharmavinayaṃ* (Senart assumes here lacuna for a verb form) *tena aparasya ākhyātavyaṃ* Mv iii.59.16 (prose); *kiṃ maṃ* (? mss. *māṃ*) *saṃjayinā . . . dṛṣṭena* 63.2 (prose), 'what's the use of our seeing Saṃjayin?'; *ye pi maṃ putrakā āsi* 84.18 (vs), 'our sons'; *te maṃ adhigatā iha* 293.19 (vs), 'they are found (attained) for (of, by) us here'; 310.10 (prose, less certain; text doubtful and boldly emended by Senart).

20.60. *nu*: (*nirvṛto pravaralakṣaṇadhārī*) *yo nu śāstā* (mss.) . . . Mv i.69.6 (vs; so more likely than interpretation of *nu* as particle).

[*vayam*: according to Senart, note on Mv ii.480.4; but the passage is otherwise dubious, and likely to be corrupt in some obscure way.]

20.61. Second person. La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1073 furnishes from a Kashgar ms. the form *tus* for edd. *vas* SP 255.11 (vs); cf. *yu* for *vo, vas* in the 'Prakrit Dhammapada', Senart JA IX.12 (1898) pp. 203, 210.

20.62. Otherwise I can only record *tuṣme* for *yuṣmākam* (presumably gen. pl.), cited by Kern, preface to SP, vii as occurring in the Kashgar recension. No reference is there furnished and I have failed to observe it in the critical notes of KN. It would correspond to a Pkt. *tumhe* which Pischel does not record as gen. pl., tho he does record *amhe* in that sense (419).

20.63. Table of Personal Pronouns

	First	Second
Stem form	Sg. *ma-* (*mu-*?) Pl. *asma-*	Sg. *tvā*(*ṃ*)-, *tvaṃ-*
Sg. Nom.	*ham* (*haṃ*), *ahu, aha, hu, ha*	*tva, tuva*(*ṃ*), *tuma*(*ṃ*), *tuhaṃ, tvayi, tvayā*
Acc.	*mama, mamā, mahyam*(?), *me, mi*	*tvaṃ* (*tvam*), *tuvaṃ, tava, tubhya*(*ṃ*), *te, ti*
Inst.	*maya, maye, mayi, me, mi, mahyaṃ*	*tvaya, tvaye, tvayi, tvayī, te, ti* (*ty*), *tubhya*(*ṃ*), *tvam*
Dat.		*tvaya*(*-m*?)
Abl.	[?*mamātu*] *mamato*	
Gen.	*mahya*(*ṃ*), *mamā, mi, mamaṃ*(?)	*tubhya*(*ṃ*), *tuhya*(*ṃ*), *tavā, ti* (*ty*), *tuma, tvam*
Loc.	(*a*)*hammi*	
Pl. Nom.	*vaya, vayu, asme, asmo, no, mo, me*	*yūya, yuṣme, yuṣmi, yuṣma*(?), *tuṃhe* (or *tuṣphe*?), *vo* (*vā*?), *yuṣmākam*
Acc.	*vayaṃ, asma, mo, maṃ, asmākaṃ*	*yūyam, yuṣmi* (*yuṣme*), *yuṣmākaṃ*
Inst.	*asmābhi, asmabhi, asmehi, asmair, asmākaṃ*	*tumhehi, yuṣmehi, yuṣme, tusphehi* (or *tuspehi*), *tubhyaṃhi*
Abl.	*asmād*	
Gen.	*asmāka* (*asmāku*), *asma, mo, maṃ, nu,* [?*vayam*]	*tus, tuṣme*(?)

21. Generic pronouns

Stems *ta* (*sa*), *eta* (*eṣa*), *ya*, *ka*, and pronominal adjectives

21.1. In so far as the peculiarities of these stems are shared by, and equally 'irregular' (from the standpoint of Sanskrit) in, noun stems in *a* or *ā*, they do not need separate treatment and have been included under such nouns. Here will be treated only forms peculiar to pronouns as such or, at any rate, forms which would not be normal in Skt. pronouns and do not seem to be as characteristic of nouns as of pronouns in our dialect. In the appropriate sections of noun inflection will be found some examples of those which have no special significance for pronouns as such; attention will be called to these by cross-references under the corresponding sections below.

21.2. Stem in composition. *ta-* occurs where Skt. would use *tad-* once, in a verse, SP 24.9, presumably m.c.: *ta-śrāvakāṇāṃ gaṇanā na vidyate*, 'of their (or his, i. e. Buddhas' or the Buddha's) disciples there is no counting.' So we must read with four Nep. mss. and the Kashgar rec.; 2 Nep. mss. *te*; KN em. *tahi*, kept by WT without note.

21.3. *taṃ-* for *tad-*: *taṃvarṇā taṃbhakṣā tadāhārā* (note this last!) Mv i.340.7 (prose, no v.l.); *taṃ-śodhanārthāya* 'for the purpose of cleaning that (privy)' SP 113.14 (vs); Kashgar rec. *tacchodh*°, but all Nep. mss. *taṃ*; text prints as separate word, misunderstanding the form.

21.4. The stem in *-d* is not used in Skt. with pronominal adjectives, except *anyad-* (Wackernagel III p.592). Once, at least, *katamad-* is so used in LV 383.5 (prose) *katamadvidhaiḥ pātraiḥ*, 'with bowls of what sort?'

21.5. Nom. sg. masc. As in MIndic generally, *so* and *eṣo* occur as generalized forms for Skt. *sa* and *eṣa*, without regard to saṃdhi. In most texts these are limited to verses, but in Mv they are common in prose. A few out of many examples:

Before voiceless consonants, *so*: SP 86.4; 87.3, 5; 88.11; 89.9; LV 135.7; *eṣo*: LV 151.8.

Before voiced consonants, *so*: SP 69.3; 88.1; 96.2, 7, 14; Mv i.3.8, 9, 10 (prose); *eṣo* LV 57.21; Mv ii.134.6.

As in Pali, we also find *sv-* before a vowel: *sv-aya devadevaḥ*, or (with all mss. but one) *sv-ayam eva devaḥ* LV 119.10 (vs) (cf. Pali *svāyaṃ* = *so 'yaṃ*); *istrigāra sv-ayaṃ* LV 213.19 (vs) 'this harem' (despite neuter gender of *istrigāra*); *eṣv āgacchati* 'here he comes' LV 221.16 (vs).

We even seem to find occasionally *su* or *eṣu* for *sa* or *eṣa* before a consonant: *teṣu eṣu śikṣitu* LV 124.18 (vs). And even in prose, *su ca* Mv i.131.15, according to all the (six) mss. (Senart em. *so ca*).

21.6. On the other hand, *eṣa* occurs in final position, at the end of a line of verse, where Skt. would have *eṣaḥ*, in LV 385.17 and 19. And contrariwise, *eṣaḥ* is used before *s-* where Skt. would have *eṣa*, in SP 15.13 (vs); this may be m.c. in a sense, but *eṣo* would do as well; perhaps *eṣaḥ* is a late, blundering attempt at Sanskritization of an original *eṣo*; but no v.l. is given.

21.7. Finally, *se* seems to be occasionally used instead of *so*: Mv ii.81.6 (vs; Senart em. *so*); Divy 180.9 (vs; one inferior ms. *sa*). And even *te*, with *t-* instead of *s-*, is presented by all the mss. Mv i.104.20 (vs); Senart emends to *so*. On the ending *-e* cf. § 8.25, where other pronominal forms in *-e* are cited. On pronominal forms in *-o*, *-a* (m.c.), and *-ā*, see §§ 8.19, 23, 24.

21.8. Nom. sg. fem. The ending *-a* occurs in pronouns as well as nouns, § 9.9.

21.9. Acc. sg. masc. and fem. The nom. may be used for acc.: *gṛhāṇa su Gautamaṃ* LV 337.7 (vs), 'seize this G.!', where *su* = *so* for *taṃ*: so Tib., dge sbyoṅ ḥdi zuṅ zhig, 'seize this monk!' Foucaux, and app. Lefmann (who prints *su-gautamaṃ* as one word), understand the prefix *su-*, which in Māra's speech is hardly possible and is contradicted by Tib.

Once *eṣāṃ* is read (in the mss.) for *etāṃ*, by analogy with *eṣā*: Mv i.365.14 (see Dict. s.v. *śakyā*).

21.10. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. The masc. *so* replaces *tad*, e. g. SP 62.7 (vs); cf. *se* in AMg. (Pischel 423) and *su* in Ap. (Sanatk. 501.3 *su bhavaṇu*; *ehu* etc. for *etad*, Jacobi, Sanatk. p. 15).

21.11. The nominal ending *-ṃ* (*-m*) replaces *-d* (*-t*), as commonly in MIndic. Instances are very numerous, in most texts chiefly in verses, but also occasionally in prose, and not only in Mv; these are marked as such.

taṃ, pronoun and adverb: SP 118.1; 213.2; 254.4; LV 188.16 (read *hi taṃ* for *hitaṃ*, with Tib.); 236.3, 5; 330.20; in prose, LV 16.20; 105.5; 140.9; 209.4; 269.19; 291.9; Mv (prose) i.36.14; 39.6; 40.3, 12; 158.11; 197.15 etc., very common; Divy 501.18 (prose); Bhad 8, 9 (in these correlated with *yac ca*), 57.

etaṃ: SP 273.10; LV 79.14; *asādhum etaṃ* Mv ii.272.9 (prose) 'this is a bad thing'.

yaṃ, pronoun and conjunction: *yaṃ ca te cintayanti* SP 124.6 (prose; repeated with other verbs in the next two lines); 212.8; 374.3; LV 47.12; 78.4; 259.2; Mv (prose) i.3.10, 13; 4.9; 7.6; 37.1; 46.1; 207.2 = ii.10.12, etc.; Divy (prose) 77.11; 87.9 (note: 'The MSS. often read *yaṃ* for *yat*'); 204.11; 466.7 (ed. wrongly *'yam*).

Pronominal adjectives: *katamaṃ* LV 26.3 (prose); *anyaṃ* Mv i.60.10 (prose); 224.21 = ii.28.1.

On forms ending in *-a*, *-u*, see §§ 8.30, 34.

21.12. For *kiṃ* of the interrogative, a short syllable is required LV 91.18 (vs); we should probably read *ki*, altho mss. and both edd. have *kiṃ*.

21.13. Oblique sg. fem. For forms in *-āye*, *-āya*, see §§ 9.37–41, 59, 62. Peculiar to pronouns, and very rare, is the ending *-asyāye*. Only one instance has been noted: *tasyāye velāye* (loc.; no v.l.) Mv iii.139.1 (prose). It is evidently a blend of *tasyā* (= *tasyāṃ*) and *tāye*. It is confirmed by the similar Pali gens. *tissāya*, *etissāya* (Geiger 105.1), blend of *tissā* (= *tassā*) and *tāya*.

21.14. Inst. sg. masc. and nt. Besides *-enā* for *-ena* m.c. (§ 8.39), we find *etinā* and *ekinā*, in prose as well as verse. This is probably an ending primarily belonging only to pronouns; a single instance, in a verse and probably m.c., has been noted in nouns (§ 8.40; Senart interprets it otherwise). Such forms as *eiṇā*, *imiṇā* occur in Pkt., and *iminā* (or *aminā*, but apparently no such forms from other pronouns; Geiger 108) in Pali; but it is not certain that Pischel (128, 428) is right (following Lassen) in taking them as analogical to Pkt. *kiṇā* for *kena*. In our dialect, at any rate, no **kinā* has been noted. We

find (besides *iminā*, § 21.57): *etinā* Mv ii.126.12; 127.16; 129.3; 130.6 (all prose, in phrase *etinā evaṃ-lūhaprahāṇena*); Dbh.g. 39(65).18; *ekinā* LV 151.8 (*ekinaiṣo*, in vs); Mv ii.103.16 (prose); 217.15 (prose; mss. *kinā*, but em. seems certain); iii.12.8 and 13.1 (vs; read the next word *striyo* with mss. in 13.1, and probably in 12.8 where *striyā* is an em.: 'begotten by one man from a woman'); 235.11 (prose).

21.15. [**Abl. sg. masc. and nt.** Thrice, in the text of Gv as printed (44.8, 9; 96.22, all prose), occurs the strange form *ekaikasyād*. In spite of the repetition, it is probably only a misprint (or error of mss.? the edition is full of glaring misprints, however) for *ekaikasmād*, which occurs in 97.5; cf. *ekasmād* in 96.26. If sound, it would be a sort of blend of abl. and gen. endings. The second ed. of Gv corrects the first and third occurrences to °*kasmād*, leaving the second uncorrected. It reads *ekaikasmād* in 96.26.]

21.16. Gen. sg. masc. and nt. On *-asyā* m.c. for *-asya* see § 8.58.—The interrogative pronoun has *kisya* (only in Mv) = Pali *kissa*, Pkt. *kīsa* (Geiger 111.1; Pischel 428). It is (as in Pali-Pkt.) specially common in the adverbial sense of 'why?', but also used as regular pronoun in the gen. sense: *kisya khu nāma kṛtena* Mv ii.222.14 (vs); cf. ii.52.6 (vs) *kisya hetu* 'because of what?' or 'for what reason?', an em. for *kima* (v.l. *kim asya*) *hetuḥ*, but confirmed by the Pali parallel Jāt. v.390.16 *kissa hetu*. Other instances, practically all in the sense of 'why?': prose, Mv ii.74.17; 75.6; 98.17; 464.15; 465.17; 476.19; 485.19; iii.25.12; 37.17; 173.15; 258.4; 330.4; vss, ii.149.2, 6, 14; iii.9.13; 294.21.

21.17. Gen. sg. fem. Adjectives which in normal Skt. have pronominal endings in this case-form may have nominal endings: *anuttarāyāḥ samyaksaṃbodher lābhino* SP 41.8 (prose).—On *-asya* in fem. *ā*-stems see § 9.75.

21.18. Gen. sg. masc. and fem. se, si. As is well known, Prakrit has a gen. sg. demonstrative *se*, masc. and fem., which Pischel (423) regards as belonging to the *sa*-stem; his theory seems supported by the gen. pl. *sānaṃ* of our dialect. It is of course analogous to *me*, *te*. We find *se* chiefly in Mv; the following seem pretty certain: (prose) i.233.13; 342.2; 346.3, 4; ii.145.2; 434.6; 479.10; 480.8; iii.32.6; (verses) ii.231.13, 14; iii.2.18; 244.15, 17. Also, KN assume *se* by em. at SP 237.11 (vs) *tahiṃ ca se viharato*; all their Nep. mss. *so*; Kashgar rec. *ca viharantasya*; WT's ms. K′ reads *so*, they em. to *sya* (= *asya*). The above cases are masc.; but fem. examples also occur: Mv (prose) ii.15.1; 172.14; 427.17; 459.2.

21.19. Furthermore, we find once *si* (= Pkt. *sĕ*, Pischel 423) for this same *se*, in a vs m.c., Śikṣ 302.5. This passage has a correspondent Mv ii.375.17, where the meter is secondarily changed and *si* is eliminated.

21.20. Loc. sg. masc. and nt. On *-asmi*, m.c. for *-asmin*, see § 8.67.—Nominal endings (*-e*, and m.c. *-i*) occur in stems which in Skt. would show pronominal endings: *sarve jage* LV 111.17; *anye* Mv ii.422.12; Mmk 58.12; 75.6 (all prose); *anyatarānyatare* Mv iii.73.2 (prose); *eke* Sukh 10.10 (prose); *eki* Gv 384.17 (vs, m.c.).

21.21. Once Mv i.217.11 (prose) has *taṃhi* (so mss., Senart *tamhi*) *dvīpe*, as regularly in Pali *tamhi* (beside *tasmiṃ*). See § 21.66, *imaṃhi*, and § 8.61 *nikhilaṃhi*.

21.22. Common, on the other hand, are the forms *tahiṃ*, *yahiṃ*, *kahiṃ* (cf. also *imahiṃ*, § 21.67); the by-forms *tahi, kahi, ekahi* also occur, but apparently only in verses, usually where meter requires short final, and never in Mv, which in prose and verse seems to know only *tahiṃ* etc. These forms are known, chiefly as locative adverbs, in Pali and Pkt., and are most commonly so used here, tho like Skt. *tatra* they are also used in the place of pronouns. Examples are all from verses except as indicated.

tahiṃ: SP 33.4; 237.11; Mv i.180.3; 231.19 (prose, v.l. *tarhi*); 232.13 (prose), etc., very common; *tahiṃ-tahiṃ* Mv i.234.6, 'here, there, and everywhere'.

yahiṃ: SP 112.7; 358.4; *yahiṃ kule* Mv i.253.5 (prose) 'in which family' (= *yasmin*); *yahiṃ deve* iii.68.2 (prose); KP 13.15, 110.6.

kahiṃ: (often with *ci-t*) SP 11.9; 47.5; 91.7; 113.2; *kahiṃ cit* 128.9 'in reference to anyone'; *akahiṃ* LV 176.22 'nowhere'; *kahiṃ* LV 214.22; 215.2; Mv i.155.7; 186.15; 198.16 (prose, *kahim* before vowel) = ii.2.18 (where Senart *kahiṃ upa-*, but v.l. *kahim*); i.221.8 = ii.23.14 (prose); i.300.1, 5 etc. (prose); ii.198.10, 12; 425.12 (prose); Samādh 19.28, 29; *kahiṃcit* Mv ii.33.2 (prose); 340.8 (vs; v.l. *karhi cit*, which is unmetr.).

tahi: SP 9.6 (in plural sense, = *teṣu*); *tahi śāsane* 26.12; 68.10; 228.12 (at end of line, not m.c.); *tahi jambumūle* LV 134.10; 166.6, 21; 296.18; *tahi lokadhātau* Samādh 8.25; Bhad 59; Dbh.g. 39(65).11 (text *ta hi*).

kahi: LV 230.6; 341.20.

ekahi: Samādh 19.16.

21.23. Loc. sg. fem. Nominal ending substituted for pronominal: *tāyāṃ velāyāṃ* Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 89.20 (prose; from Bhadrapāla Sūtra; Pali also has *tāyaṃ velāyaṃ*); *katamāyāṃ* (v.l. °*yaṃ*) Mv ii.73.3 (prose); *anuttarāyāṃ samyaksaṃbodhau* SP 64.11; 67.2; 69.6; 70.12; 261.15 etc., all prose, common; for 261.15 the Kashgar fragment Lüders ap. Hoernle MR 144.1 has *anuttarasyā(ṃ)*, which would be the regular Skt. form (tho the masc.-nt. loc. of *uttara* may be nominal, Wackernagel III § 268c).

21.24. Nom.-acc. dual nt. On *eti*, m.c. for *ete*, probably acc. dual nt., see § 8.77.

21.25. Nom. pl. masc. For regular *-e*, as for any final *-e*, *-i* is common, but only in verses m.c. A few examples: *ti*: SP 310.3. — *eti*: SP 90.2; 162.6; LV 171.3; RP 12.11; Gv 481.3, 6, 8. — *yi*, probably to be read SP 83.11 for KN *vi(bhakṣayantaḥ)*; Kashgar rec. *ye bhakṣayanti*; WT *ca bhakṣayantaḥ* with their ms. K′. There is otherwise no cpd. *vi-bhakṣ-*; the unmetrical *ye* and the variant *vi-* together seem to suggest *yi*. — *sarvi* SP 62.2 etc.; LV 74.14 etc.; Mv ii.53.19 (v.l. *sarva*); Suv 38.8 etc. — *pūrvi* SP 176.12. — *anyi* LV 171.3.

21.26. The nominal ending *-ās* occurs in pronominal adjectives but rarely (cf. *-ā(s)* as acc. pl.): *sarvā* (followed by *g-*) LV 295.17 (prose); agrees with *yāvanto . . . aśrutapūrvāḥ*, lines 13–14. So all mss., only Calc. *sarve*.

21.27. But quite common, tho only in verses, is the ending *-a*. It seems clearly m.c., and since otherwise *-e* is apparently not reduced to *-a*, we must doubtless understand this as representing *-ās*, the nominal ending. *ta*: *sarvi ta* (no v.l.) *nirmita* LV 307.19 'all these were formed by magic'; Gv 256.12. — *ya*: *ya* (WT with K′ *ye*) *śobhayiṣyanti* SP 149.14; others, LV 341.5; Śikṣ 329.12 (read *sahanti ya*; from Ratnolkādhāraṇī); *ya keci jināḥ* Gv 286.1. —[*ka*: *ye ka-cit* Śikṣ 109.9, so text; but probably misprint; meter requires *ke*.] — *sarva* SP 191.2 (?possibly acc. pl. with *vimāna*); LV 74.10, 17; Dbh.g. 17(353).2. — *anya* SP 325.4; LV 153.12.

21.28. The nom. sg. *eṣa* seems to be used as nom. pl. in *eṣa nirvṛtim upema ihaiva* Mv i.69.12 (vs), 'we here approach nirvāṇa right in this life'. The only alternative would be to understand it as for **eṣām* = *etām*, acc. sg. fem. (analogical to *eṣā* nom.). On sg. for pl. nom. forms see §§ 8.83, 10.190.

21.29. Nom. pl. fem. On *(e)tāyo* see § 9.89.

21.30. Acc. pl. masc. As regularly in MIndic, the ending *-e* is used as acc. as well as nom. It has been noted only in verses in most texts, but in prose of Mv, e. g.: *nāhaṃ . . . ye dharmā anityās te nityato deśayāmi* Mv i.173.1–2 (prose), 'I do not declare states which are impermanent to be permanent', and parallel phrases in the sequel (note how easily, by attraction to the nom. pl. *ye*,

an acc. *te* could be introduced in such a context); Mv ii.141,3; 427.18.

21.31. Otherwise in verses: *te* SP 45.3; 87.11; LV 172.17; *te* (sc. *kāmān*; at beginning of pāda, hence not enclitic 'of thee' with Senart) *vai jāne* Mv i.180.5 (read in preceding °*jñaś ca* with mss., going with subject of *jāne*); Mv i.189.9; 278.11; Suv 45.10; RP 19.7; Gv 362.14. — *ete* SP 209.7. — *ye* SP 115.7, *anye c' ato viṃśati ye mi dṛṣṭaḥ*, 'and for 20 more (years) than that during which he has been seen by me' (text *viṃśatiye*, less likely, as acc. pl. of *viṃśati*). — *anye* SP 10.8; 115.7 (see preceding); LV 49.11. — *sarve tava saṃkalpāṃ* (= °*pān*) Mv i.202.15 = ii.6.12. — *aneke* SP 53.5; 96.9 (all but Kashgar mss.). — *pūrve* LV 196.12 *pūrve ... supine imi ad(d)ṛśāsi*.

21.32. And *-i*, m.c. for preceding: *sarvi* SP 195.4; 351.4; LV 201.11; 308.7; 366.19; Bhad 1, 10 etc.; Samādh 8.7; Gv 241.11 (see Dict. s.v. *āmukhīsthita*).

21.33. *-ā*, and m.c. *-a*. Cf. §§ 8.92–94; probably transferred from nom. pl. ending of nouns; rare: *sahasranekā* (but Nep. mss. all °*ke*) *nayutāṃś ca bhūyaḥ* SP 96.9 (vs); *kāyā* (mss. *kāyaḥ*!) *sarva paneti* LV 330.13 (vs), 'he evaluates all bodies'(?).—Weller takes *sarvā* LV 3.14 (prose; *sā sarvā śuddhāvāsān*) as acc. pl.; but it may well be nom. sg. fem. with *sā*, sc. *raśmiḥ*.

21.34. On *sānaṃ*, once as acc. pl., see § 21.45.

21.35. Acc. pl. fem. *tān*, *tāṃ* as fem., see § 9.99.

21.36. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. Endings *-ā*, *-a* (m.c.), and *-e*, as in nouns, see §§ 8.100, 101, 103.

21.37. Inst. pl. masc. and fem. On the endings *-ehi*, *-ehī*, *-ebhis*, *-ebhi*, and (fem.) *-āhi*, see §§ 8.108–111; 9.102.

21.38. Gen. pl. *-eṣa*, only in vss m.c. for *-eṣām*; usually before consonants, but also before vowels, *eteṣa* (v.l. °*ṣu*; WT *ete sam-*) SP 303.6, 8. Others: *teṣa* SP 68.10; 90.9; 95.7 etc.; LV 54.1; 114.9; 115.2 etc.; Samādh 19.16, 35; Suv 41.1; 45.9 etc.; Gv 256.25. — *eteṣa* SP 306.2. — *keṣa-ci(d)* Samādh 19.25. — *yeṣa* SP 97.10; 304.9 (WT var.); LV 37.3; 46.7; Mv i.204.7 = ii.8.2; Samādh 19.29; 22.5. — *sarveṣa* Samādh 8.30. — *pareṣa* SP 94.6 (WT with Nep. mss. °*ṣu*).

21.39. *-eṣam*, only in vss m.c. for *-eṣām*, and only before vowels: *teṣam* SP 86.9; RP 9.2; 28.2.

21.40. *-eṣu*, *-eṣv* (before vowel), also only in vss m.c. for *-eṣām*: *teṣv* SP 203.10, acc. to WT with their ms. K′, *teṣv anu°* (KN *teṣ' anu°* with Kashgar rec., Nep. mss. *te anu°*); *teṣu mokṣa* (so with v.l., m. c.) *nacireṇa bheṣyate* LV 54.14, 'they will get salvation soon'; Mv i.151.7; Bhad 4, 5, 6, 6[1], 19, 25 etc. — *yeṣu* LV 54.1 (v.l. *yeṣa*). — *pareṣu dāraṃ* Mv i.286.9, 'the wife of others'.

21.41. *-ānaṃ*, for *-ānāṃ*, the nominal ending; MIndic form, not m.c. (in prose and before consonant): *tānaṃ devānaṃ* Mv iii.304.3, mss. (Senart em. *devānaṃ* to *devatānāṃ*, but he leaves *tānaṃ* as in mss.)

21.42. *-āna*, only in vss. m.c. for *-ānāṃ*, the nominal ending. *etāna* SP 83.8; *tāna* Bhad 56 (seems to be probably the true reading, with v.l., for text *tāya*, but Gv 547.16 also *tāya*); *sarvāṇa* SP 89.9; Samādh 8.22, 24.

21.43. *-ana*, m.c. for same: *anyana* RP 21.4 (= *anyeṣām*).

21.44. *-eṣāṇāṃ* (also written *-ęṣānāṃ*), blend of *-eṣāṃ* and *-ānāṃ*, as in Pali (*-esānaṃ*, Geiger 105.1; 113.1); noted only in vss of Mmk: *eteṣāṇāṃ* Mmk 499.25; 511.2; *sarveṣāṇāṃ* Mmk 387.2; 500.1 (in the latter spelled °*nāṃ*).

21.45. *sānaṃ* occurs many times in Mv, apparently as gen. pl. of the pron. stem *ta-* (*sa-*); in one case, i.7.13, an acc. pl. seems required (note that the following *āviddhānām* of the text is an emendation). See Senart's note i.373; he refers to Weber, Bhagavatī (1866), 422 note, where Weber doubtfully quotes the same form from this AMg.text, querying whether it intends Skt. *svānāṃ*. (Pischel 423 seems to ignore the form.) It happens that at Mv i.5.9 *svānaṃ* is actually read in the mss.; but this is isolated. Other variants noted in the mss. are *sāna*, *sānā*, *manaṃ*, *sātaṃ*, *sotaṃ*; but they seem all to be mere corruptions, and it seems impossible to doubt the reality of the form *sānaṃ*. Nearly all the following occurrences are prose, and in the great majority no v.l. is reported. Mv i.5.6, 9; 7.4, 10, 12; 8.2, 5, 6; 18.14; 20.4; 26.6; 27.6; 31.4; 340.8; 341.2, 14; 342.9; 345.5, 10; 346.1; 347.19; 355.6; ii.27.18; 121.4; 122.7, 15; 123.4; 172.11; 214.6; 234.5 = iii.65.6 = iii.92.10; ii.282.16, 17; 412.12 ff. (repeatedly); iii.28.18; 70.18; 72.5; 87.8; 114.7, 8; 282.11; 283.2, 7; 329.13; 379.16; 426.17; 427.6 ff.; 430.16; 432.3, 4.

21.46. Paradigms.
Stem in comp.: *ta-*, *taṃ-*; *katamad-*

Masc. | Nt. | Fem.

Sg. Nom. *so, sv, su, eṣu, se*
Acc. *etu*, etc., *eta*

Sg. Nom.-Acc. *so, taṃ; yaṃ* etc.; *etu* etc., *ta, eta; ke, ki* (?)

Sg. Nom. *eṣa*

Inst. *yenā, etinā, ekinā*
Abl. [*ekaikasyād*?]
Gen. *tasyā* etc.; *se, si; kisya*
Loc. *tasmi* etc.; *taṃhi; tahiṃ, yahiṃ, kahiṃ; tahi, kahi, ekahi; sarve* etc.; *eki*

Obl. *tāya, tāye*, etc.; *tasyāye*
Gen. *tasya; se; anuttarāyāḥ*

Pl. Nom. *ti, yi*, etc.; *sarvās; ta, ya* etc.; *eṣa*
Acc. *te, ye, sarve* etc.; *sarvi; anekā*

Pl. Nom.-Acc. *yā* etc.; *ya, te*

Pl. Nom. (*e*)*tāyo*
Acc. *tān, tāṃ*
Inst. (*e*)*tāhi*

Inst. *tehi* etc.; *tehī, yehī; tebhis, yebhis; tebhi* etc.; *sarvebhī*
Gen. *teṣa* etc.; *teṣam; teṣu* etc.; *tānaṃ; tāna* etc., *anyana; eteṣāṇāṃ, sarveṣāṇāṃ; sānaṃ*

Stems *ena, na*

21.47. In Class. Skt. the forms of *ena* are enclitic only (on Vedic see Wackernagel III pp. 524, 525). Here they were certainly not always enclitic. In AsP 227.9 (prose) *enām* begins a sentence and is emphasized by *eva*; *enām eva* also id. 255.7, 12, and elsewhere in this text.

21.48. Like Pali and Pkt., our language contains a stem *na*, apparently a reduced form of *ena*. Even this occurs at the beginning of a line of verse, *neṣāṃ* SP 48.9 (gen. pl.). This (which = Pali *nesaṃ*) is the only form I have noted other than acc. sg., of which the fem. *nāṃ* occurs Mv ii.247.8, 10 (to be sure with v.l. *tāṃ* the first time, *taṃ* — but it must be fem.!—the second). Otherwise there is only *naṃ*, once acc. sg. nt., Mv i.57.3, otherwise acc. sg. masc. This occurs at least once at the beginning of a sentence, in Mv ii.168.7–8 (prose), *gacchatha naṃ atimuktake* (v.l. °*kaṃ*, Senart em. °*ka-*) *śmaśāne netvā jīvaśūlakaṃ karotha*, 'go, take him to the A. cemetery and make him to be impaled on a stake.' Other instances of *naṃ*, acc. masc.: Mv i.211.18 f. = ii.15.18 f.; i.212.1 = ii.16.1; i.301.16; ii.247.6; 426.4; 447.2; iii.409.12 (these all prose); verses ii.81.6; 187.8 (? *dṛṣṭvā nam*).

ayam etc.: stem *ima-* inflected throughout

21.49. Besides relics of various Skt. forms, MIndic generally has a full pronominal inflexion based on the stem *ima*, which in Skt. is used only in the acc. sg. (masc. and fem.) and in the nom. acc. dual and plural. This stem is used in Pali in all cases except the nom. sg. masc. and fem. (Geiger 108), and in Pkt. in all without this exception (Pischel 430). Our language agrees with Pkt. It even uses the stem *ima-* in a compound. These forms are not limited to verses, tho commonest there (except, as usual, in Mv where they are equally common in prose). Once, at least, a Kashgar fragment of SP has *imasmiṃ* in prose where the printed edd. read *asmin* without report of variant.—As in the preceding sections, we shall refer to the treatment of *a-* and *ā-*stem nouns for endings which concern nouns as much as pronouns.

21.50. Stem ima- in composition: *ima-guṇa* (for °*ṇā*, m.c.) *vacanā* RP 47.8 (vs), '(Buddha's) voice has these good qualities.' — *imīdṛśāni* SP 120.2 (vs), perhaps for *im*(*a*)-*īd*°, 'such things as these' (Kashgar rec. wholly different).

21.51. Nom. sg. masc. imo (ima? ime?): Mv (all prose) *imo* ii.64.17; 152.15; iii.301.11; *imāhaṃ* (= *ayam ahaṃ, so 'haṃ*) ii.244.12, perhaps for *ima* (or *imo*) *ahaṃ*. — *ime*, as in AMg. (Pischel 430); Mv ii.82.12 (prose), mss. *ime*, Senart em. *imo*.

21.52. Nom. sg. fem. imā (also *imu*, see § 9.13): Mv i.66.8 (vs); ii.65.6 (prose, mss. *imāṃ*); 174.14 (prose).

21.53. Acc. sg. masc.: See §§ 8.30, 38, for the forms *imu, imāṃ*.

21.54. Acc. sg. fem.: see §§ 9.16, 19, 23 for the forms *imam, ima, imu*. Especially *ima* is common in verses m.c.

21.55. Nom.-acc. sg. nt. imaṃ (and m.c. *ima, imu, im'*, as in nt. *a*-stem nouns); very common instead of *idaṃ*; chiefly in verses in most texts, but there are prose cases in SP and LV as well as Mv, viz., prose: *imaṃ saṃkāradhānaṃ śodhayatā* SP 106.15 (*saṃkāradhāna* 'privy' is nt. just before, 105.12–13); *imaṃ samyagjñānaṃ* LV 400.15; others Mv i.346.6, 7; ii.110.1; 169.15; 195.14; iii.22.21, etc. A few out of many examples from verses: *imaṃ* SP 93.7; 228.7; LV 178.14; 392.3; *te viditam imaṃ ca paraṃ ca* Mv iii.381.10, 'known to you is this (world, life) and the beyond'; *ima* SP 95.6; *imu* SP 90.10; *bhuv'* (= *abhuvat*) *imu* (nom. nt.) LV 222.11, 21; Bhad 42 etc.; *im' evarūpaṃ* (= *idam evaṃrūpam*, nom. nt.) SP 95.12. —In Mv ii.345.11 (vs) text *imo*, v.l. *ime*, but meter requires short final; read *imu*? (or *imŏ*?).

21.56. Inst. sg. masc.-nt. imena: SP (vss) 28.3; 90.9; Mv (prose) i.301.13; ii.107.1; 180.18; 256.5; iii.290.15; (vs) ii.104.16; Mmk 618.25 (vs).

21.57. Inst. sg. masc.-nt. iminā, the regular Pali form; also Pkt. *iminā* (Ś.Mg., and, beside *imeṇa*, also JM., Pischel 430): Mv i.132.15; iii.53.8, 10 (all prose). Cf. § 21.14, *etinā, ekinā*.

21.58. [**Inst. sg. masc.-nt. eminā**: *ahaṃ na* (14 . . . *naiva*) *kasyacid emināpi acchindāmi* (Senart em. *ācchi*°) Mv iii.403.12 and 14 (prose), so Senart, but read . . . *kasyaci demi nāpi*, see Dict. s.v. *acchindati*.]

21.59. Inst. sg. fem. imāye and imāya: *imāye* Mv iii.163.7 (prose); *imāya* 426.6 (prose).

21.60. Dat. sg. masc.-nt. imāya: Suv 44.5 (vs; interpretation not entirely certain).

21.61. Abl. sg. masc.-nt. imāto: Mv ii.253.7 (prose).

21.62. Gen. sg. masc.-nt. imasya: SP 149.8 (vs); LV 314.16 (vs); Mv i.38.4; 246.10; 364.2 (all prose); Suv 65.6; 66.9 (both prose; in both most mss. *asya*).

21.63. Gen. sg. fem. imasyā(s): *imasyā* (*m-*) Mv i.363.14 (prose).—On *imasya* as fem. see § 9.75.

21.64. Gen. sg. fem. imāye: Mv i.223.4 (prose).

21.65. Loc. sg. masc.-nt. imasmiṃ, common: SP, acc. to Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 133.4 (prose), for KN 327.3 *asmin*; Mv (prose) i.50.14; 320.19; 336.5 etc. For *imasmi* (m.c.), see § 8.67.

21.66. Loc. sg. masc.-nt. imaṃhi (= Pali *imamhi*), cf. *taṃhi* and *nikhilaṃhi* §§ 21.21 and 8.61, occurs repeatedly in the mss. of Mv and should certainly be admitted. Senart admits it at i.185.20 (vs); see his note on this; yet this particular passage *could* be read *imaṃ* (= *idaṃ*) *hi*. But in other places, strangely, Senart rejects the form and emends to *imahiṃ* (see below). Thus: *imaṃhi* (v.l. *imāhi*) *āgamanaprayojanaṃ* ii.107.6 'reason for coming here'; *ahaṃ pi imaṃhi evam* (v.l. *eva*) *osiṣyaṃ* ii.478.7, so mss., Senart *āsiṣyaṃ*; read *vasiṣyaṃ*, with what appears to be the same phrase ii.463.2, *ahaṃ pi imahiṃ* (so Senart with one ms., v.l. *imaṃhi*) *vasiṣyaṃ*, 'I too will dwell here'; ii.480.12; iii.154.2; 167.3; 290.2 (here one ms. *imehi*, which can be interpreted, 'with these'); 290.4. All these, except i.185.20, are prose, and except as stated both mss. read *imaṃhi*; Senart always reads *imahiṃ* except in i.185.20, but without good reason.

21.67. Loc. sg. masc.-nt. imahiṃ (cf. *tahiṃ, yahiṃ, kahiṃ*, § 21.22): Mv iii.102.19 (prose; v.l. *imehi*); and perhaps ii.463.2 (v.l. *imaṃhi*, see just above).

21.68. Loc. sg. fem. imasyāṃ: Mv iii.153.19 (v.l. *imasyā*, in that case gen.).

21.69. Nom. pl. masc. imi, in vss m.c. for *ime*, common: SP 86.8; 92.3; 93.6; Samādh 19.30; Dbh.g. 7(343).14. (In Bhad 58 *imi praṇidhānā* must be an error for *ime*, required by meter, tho no ms. is quoted as reading so.)

21.70. Acc. pl. masc. ime (*imi, ima*), nom. for acc., as with other pronouns, §§ 21.30–33: *ime*, Mv ii.147.2; 435.11 (both prose); *imi* (vss), SP 33.1; LV 196.12; 385.7; *ima*(?), SP 281.14, so KN with their Nep. mss. as reported; WT with their K′ *imi*; Kashgar rec. reported *ime* (unmetrical).

21.71. Nom.-acc. pl. nt. ime, see § 8.103.

21.72. Inst. pl. masc.-nt. imais: Suv 105.5 (vs); Mmk 23.3 (prose); 480.15 and 492.5 (vss). In all the vss, *ebhis* would be metrically satisfactory.

21.73. Inst. pl. masc.-nt. imebhiḥ: Mv i.110.9 (prose; v.l. *imehi*; before *s-*); Mmk 4.20 (prose).

21.74. Inst. pl. masc.-nt. imehi, noted only in Mv; all examples but one from prose: Mv i.17.4; 50.14 (in loc. sense); 80.1; 89.6; 198.9 = ii.2.6; i.306.18 (vs; in abl. sense); 364.5; ii.293.11; 485.16; iii.73.17.

21.75. Inst. pl. masc.-nt. imehir, Mv i.90.6 (prose) *imehir aṣṭ*° (*-r-* 'hiatus-bridger'?).

21.76. Inst. pl. fem. imābhiḥ: Suv 132.13; 177.5; 243.9 (all prose); and *imāhi*, Mv iii.269.16 (vs).

21.77. Gen. pl. masc.-nt. imeṣāṃ: Mv i.273.16; 329.18; 335.1; 347.14; 350.11; 365.10; ii.434.19; iii.55.10 (all prose); iii.84.3 (vs).

21.78. Loc. pl. masc.-nt. imeṣu: Śikṣ 16.6 (prose; from Praśāntaviniścayaprātihārya-sūtra).

ayam etc.: phonetic alterations of Sanskrit forms

21.79. Hardly worthy of more than passing attention at this point are the following phonetic matters:

yaṃ for *ayam*, nom. sg. masc., after a vowel in a verse (really a matter of saṃdhi); *tam eva yaṃ* SP 28.6; *vyakta yaṃ* LV 81.14 and 16.

ayu (after a vowel *yu*, cf. preceding) for *ayaṃ*, only in vss m.c. (any final *-aṃ* may become *-u*, § 3.58): SP 10.2; 16.4; 27.13; 113.9; 114.4 etc.; LV 50.13; 81.20; 236.4; *prāpta yu kālu* (= *prāpto 'yaṃ kālo*) 326.16; *ayu dharma* 393.15.

iya for *iyaṃ*, nom. sg. fem., in vss m.c.: *prabhṛtīya* (= *prabhṛtir iyaṃ*) SP 63.13; 92.13; LV 174.11; 292.6.

ida for *idaṃ*, nom.-acc. sg. nt., in vss m.c.: SP 97.14; 98.8; LV 57.3.

For *asyā* as gen. sg. masc., *asyā* and *asya* as gen. sg. fem., *asmi* as loc. sg. masc., see §§ 8.58; 9.74–76; 8.67.

ayam etc.; miscellaneous non-Sanskrit forms

21.80. There remain a few odds and ends. First, Senart Mv i.417 note, cites a form *ahaṃ* = *ayam* (nom. sg. masc.), referring to Hemacandra 3.87. But what Hem. prescribes is not *ahaṃ* but *aha*; and he equates it not with *ayam* but with *asau*, *adas* (all three genders). According to Pischel 432, all the alleged occurrences of this *aha* may be interpreted as representing the adverb *atha*. Anyhow, some of Senart's cases for the alleged *ahaṃ* = *ayam* are unconvincing. Thus, in i.53.2, *ahaṃ* means 'I'; the Buddha shifts to the first person, summing up his experiences in past births. In i.322.3, also, it means 'I'; a speech of Jyotipāla follows. In ii.371.2 also *ahaṃ* is 'I'; read the verb *bhomi* (with one of two mss.). There remain: (1) i.5.2, where however the mss. read *āha*; the passage seems corrupt, but emendation to *ahaṃ* = *ayaṃ* is rash. (2) i.348.7 *tenāhaṃ rājā* (no v.l.). (3) iii.49.6, not listed by Senart: *na cāhaṃ kumārako . . .*, repeating the same phrase from 48.19 where *nāyaṃ ku°* is read. In the last two, *ahaṃ* 'I' is senseless; but especially the last looks like a mere corruption for *ayaṃ*; perhaps the other is, too.

21.81. In the nom. sg. fem., Pali and Pkt. use *ayaṃ*, the masc. form, freely instead of, or beside, *iyaṃ*. So also our dialect; I have noted instances only in Mv, but many there. Prose: i.214.12 = ii.17.10; i.338.20; 344.8; *ayaṃ velā* ii.172.8; ii.428.15, 16; 459.17; iii.54.1 ff.—Verses: i.203.15 = ii.7.11 (in the same line i.146.14, *iyaṃ*); i.165.10; i.207.3 = ii.10.14; ii.18.4 (in the same line i.215.7, *iyaṃ*); i.247.18; 304.17; ii.194.18.

21.82. For *idam*, nom.-acc. sg. nt., we find, rarely, both Skt. masc. and fem. forms substituted. Both are so used in Aśoka's inscriptions: Hultzsch lxv, lxxix, xciii, etc. (*ayaṃ*, *iyaṃ*, *iyo*); *ayaṃ* also in AMg. (Pischel 429). *ayaṃ avalokitaṃ nāma vyākaraṇaṃ* Mv ii.258.11 and 13 (prose; repetition of 257.13 which has *imaṃ*, v.l. *idaṃ*); *ayu* LV 173.10 (vs) 'this (thing; indefinite)'; m.c. for *ayaṃ*; but the ms. A reads *amu* (§ 21.86). (The preceding word *tūryaravau*, all mss., is troublesome; Tib. sil sñan sgra las, suggesting abl., *ravā(d)*? Or *°ravai(r)*? Tib. certainly does not make *ayu* agree with this word, as Calc. does, reading *°ravo*.) *tad iyaṃ* Mv ii.54.7 (vs), apparently = *idaṃ*.

21.83. In the inst. sg. masc.-nt. there are a few cases of *ena*; so M. and Ap. *eṇa* (Pischel 429; Jacobi, Bhav. 38*): LV 223.11; 224.18, 19; 237.7; 355.7 and 8 (all vss).

21.84. [If we could trust Senart's printed text, we should have to accept *sya* and *syā*, as gen. sg. masc. and fem. respectively, after consonants. But I think Senart is wrong.

(a) Mv i.278.3 (vs) is printed *rāṣṭram sya dubbalaṃ bhoti . . .* But the mss. read (with slight corruptions): *rāṣṭrasya dullabhaṃ bhoti chidraṃ bhūtaṃ samantatah.* The sense is good except that a negative seems required. Read perhaps *rāṣṭrasyādullabhaṃ*: 'of his kingdom it is not hard to find a weak spot, a real one (? or, 'one that has occurred'), on any side.' Also in line 5, two lines below, read with 1 of the 2 mss.: *rāṣṭrasya* (Senart *rāṣṭraṃ sya* with v.l.) *sthāvaraṃ* (mss. *°ro*) *bhavati ṛddhaṃ . . .*, 'his kingdom has solid wealth, abundant' etc. (*sthāvara* neuter noun, not adj.).

(b) Mv i.199.9 (vs) reads *yasyeha pariśeṣaṃ syā nārīye jīvitaṃ bhavet*; but in the repetition ii.3.7 the mss. have *syān*, which is the correct reading; it is the adverbial *syāt*, 'perchance' (see Dict.) The pronoun *asyāḥ* would, in fact, be scarcely interpretable here; the statement is a general one and does not refer to a specific woman. Senart assumes *yasyā(ḥ) . . . asyāḥ* together as indefinite, referring to Childers p. 602, 2d column; but in this idiom, I think, the form of *ya-* is always immediately followed by that of *ayam*.]

21.85. Paradigm for *ayam*, *idan*
Stem in composition: *ima-*

		Masc.	Nt.	Fem.
Sg.	Nom.	*imo, ime, ima* (?), *yaṃ, ayu,* [*ahaṃ* (?)]	*ida, imaṃ, ima, imu, im', ayaṃ, ayu, iyaṃ* (Nom. and Acc.)	*imā, iya, ayaṃ*
	Acc.	*imu, imāṃ*		*imaṃ, ima, imu*
	Inst.	*imena, iminā, ena*		*imāye, imāya*
	Dat.	*imāya*		
	Abl.	*imāto*		
	Gen.	*imasya, asyā*		*asyā, asya, imasyā(s), imāye, imasya*
	Loc.	*asmi, imasmiṃ, imaṃhi, imahiṃ*		
Pl.	Nom.	*imi*	*ime* (Nom. and Acc.)	
	Acc.	*ime, imi*		
	Inst.	*imais, imebhiḥ, imehi(r)*		*imābhiḥ, imāhi*
	Gen.	*imeṣāṃ*		
	Loc.	*imeṣu*		

asau, adas

21.86. Practically nothing non-Sanskritic concerning this pronoun has been observed. In LV 111.21 *amau* is printed, but (tho not corrected in either of the two Corrigenda) it is certainly a misprint for *asau* as in Calc. (no v.l. is cited). In LV 173.10 (vs) the best ms. A has *amu*, for *ayu* (§ 21.82) of the other mss.; the word is nt., 'this (thing)'; if *amu* is the true reading, it would be (? m.c.) for *amuṃ* which is used in Pkt. as nt. nom.-acc. (transferred from the Skt. acc. sg. masc.; Pali uses *aduṃ*). The same *amu* is given by Nobel in Suv 51.13 (vs), where it appears to be acc. sg. masc. (understand *svapnaṃ*); some mss. *amuṃ*; meter is difficult with either reading, -*u* seems required. In the following line 14 Nobel also reads *amu*, on the basis of Tib. but against all his mss. which have *teṣu*; the same metrical difficulties would apply here too.

22. Noun suffixes

22.1. Here I shall refer to extensions of, or additions to, Sanskrit usage in respect of noun suffixes, both primary and secondary. Some of them are used nearly or quite as in Sanskrit; such cases are, in general, recorded here when the suffix clearly remains productive in BHS, in a way which makes certain or likely the post-Sanskritic origin of some of its examples (as in the case of the suffix *ana* added to present stems used as 'roots'). In other cases new suffixes, or new uses of Sanskrit suffixes, will be noted.

Suffix *aka*

22.2. The suffix *aka* is used with rather specialized verbal force, in a way not to my knowledge quite paralleled in Skt., referring both to the future (= 'intending to, for the purpose of'), and to the past when such forms are hardly more than periphrases for preterite verbs. What may be interpreted as adverbial accs. of such stems are used in a way that approximates gerunds. All these forms may perhaps be regarded as containing secondary *-ka* affixed to stems in *-a*; see § 35.5.

22.3. Referring to future: *bhagavato pādavandakā(ḥ)* Mv i.300.4 (they came) 'for the purpose of saluting the Lord's feet' (but found him gone); i.300.12; (°*ko*) ii.271.17; see Dict. for *prekṣikā, nirīkṣikā*; (*pānīyaṃ*) *pāyako* 'to drink water'; (*pāṇikhātanadī*)*snāyako* 'to bathe'; *vadhaka* 'intending to kill'.

22.4. Referring to the past: *pañcāśa varṣā pi tadā palāyakaḥ* SP 112.1 (vs), 'even for fifty years he then was a fugitive' (Kashgar rec. *palāyitaḥ*; WT with ms. K′ *palānakaḥ*); *kiṃ nu khalu purimakā samyaksaṃbuddhā bhājanapratigrāhakā utāho pāṇipratigrāhakā* (mss. °*hato*), *bhājanapratigrāhakā* . . . Mv iii.304.7 (prose), 'did the former Buddhas (in first breaking the seven-weeks' fast after enlightenment) take a bowl (of food), or water? They took a bowl.'

22.5. Quasi-gerunds in *-akam*: *-kārakaṃ, -hārakaṃ* (§ 35.5); a list of such forms (incl. *-kārakaṃ*) occurs in Mvy 8577 ff. and in parallels (Dict.): *niścārakam, pṛthakkārakam, apahārakam, chedakam, sphoṭakam, avalehakam, saṃdhunakam*. Pali has similar forms in the corresponding section of the Pātimokkha.

22.6. More in line with the normal Skt. use of *aka* as primary suffix (Wh. Gr. 1181) is *jānaka* 'knowing, wise' and *a-j*° (Dict.), apparently based on the present stem *jāna-ti* used as quasi-root.

Suffix *atha*, see Suffix *tha*

Suffix *ana, anā*

22.7. Nouns of action, including infinitives. As a noun of action suffix, *ana* or *anā* remains freely productive in BHS. Nouns are formed with it from present stems (e. g. *niṣīdana* = Pali *nisīdana*; *spṛśana* = Pali *phusana*; *manyanā* or °*na* = Pali *maññanā*; *paśyana*; *śiṣyaṇa* from passive *śiṣyate*, etc.), which in BHS take the place of verbal roots. In a few exceptional cases they seem even to be formed from noun or adjective stems (*kūṭanā* 'fraudulent practice', to *kūṭa*; *ākūtana* = *ākūta* 'wish, intent'; *niyatana* 'determination, fixation', to *niyata*; *vijñānanā* and *saṃjñānanā*, Dict.). But these are no doubt the result of special analogies. In general, *ana* is a primary suffix, here as in Skt. Datives from *ana* stems function quite often as infinitives (§ 36.15). Occasionally, the abstract-forming secondary suffix *tā* is added, without change of meaning, to stems in *ana*; § 22.41.

22.8. The following action-nouns, including stems of infinitives, will be found recorded in the Dict., besides those mentioned above: *adhimucyanā, anutapyana, anupaśyanā, anubudhyana, abhisaṃbuddhana, avamanyanā, avasṛjana, āpadyana, ālikhana, utpadyana, utsṛjana, uddiśana, ovidhyana, krudhyana, gṛhṇana, citraṇā, jāgraṇa, tudanā* (°*na*), *trāyaṇa, parikarmaṇa* (?), *paritasyana* (°*nā*), *paritrāyaṇa, pithana* or °*nā, prajahana, pratideśanā, pratipadyana, pratihanyanā, prīyaṇā, bībhatsana, bu(d)dhyana, muñcana, muṣaṇa, mokṣāyaṇa* (from denom. *mokṣāyati*), *rajyanā, rundhanā* or °*nā, lālapyana* (from intensive stem), *vijahana* or °*nā, vipaśyanā, vibuddhana* and *vibudhyana, śruṇana, samāpadyana, saṃpratīcchana*.

22.9. Nouns of agent. As in Sanskrit, the suffix is also productive of new nouns of agent (or adjectives with meaning resembling pres. pples.) in BHS, but they are less common than nouns of action; examples: *ājñāpana, dadana, muñcana* (?), *vijñāpana, vibhrāmaṇa*.

Suffix *ānī*, and feminine suffixes *ayanī, āyanī, āyanikā, (ā)yinī*

22.10. Renou, Gr. Scte. § 212 a, notes the BHS fem. *Śākiyānī*, which follows an ancient Skt. model; cf. *kṣatriyāṇī*. As names of scripts, *yonānī* (cf. Skt. Gr. *yavanānī*) and *śakānī* are recorded. On Skt. *araṇyānī*, Renou § 204, may be directly based BHS *vanānī*, 'vast forest'. More isolated (cf. Renou § 212 b) are the feminine forms *Śākyayanī, Śākyāyanī* (or °*yinī*) and °*nikā*; and *śākunikāyinī*, 'female bird-catcher'.

Suffix *āra* (for *āla*?)

22.11. Pischel 595 notes the secondary suffix *āla* in Pkt. The same or a related suffix seems to occur in *potāra*, 'boat' = Skt. *pota*. See also *potalaka*, § 22.47.

Suffix *(ā)vin*, see Suffix *vin*

Suffix *itar*

22.12. The agent suffix *(i)tar* is added, in this form, to the present stem of a verb, functioning in MIndic fashion as 'root', in *vibhajitar*, which would be in Skt. *vibhaktar*. The result looks like a *seṭ* for an *aniṭ* form, but is actually, of course, only a late MIndicism.

Suffix *(i)ma*

22.13. The suffix *ma* was used in Skt. in forming contrastive adjectives with superlative force, and some ordinal numerals (Whitney 474, 487d, e). One isolated superlative has been noted in BHS, from a word of a type which in Skt. would use *tama* instead: *spaṣṭa-ma* 'most clear', in a verse, guaranteed by the meter. In addition,

BHS has two or three contrastive adjectives in which *ma* is affixed to certain or possible bases ending in *i*, like Skt. *ādi-ma*, but which are not Skt.: *upari-ma* (Pali id.), 'upper, topmost', to *upari*; *pṛṣṭhi-ma* (unparalleled elsewhere), 'rear, hindside', which may be derived from BHS *pṛṣṭhi* rather than Skt. *pṛṣṭha*; and *heṣṭima* (Pali *heṭṭhima*), 'lowest, bottommost', a semi-MIndic form, cf. BHS *heṣṭe*, *heṣṭi*, AMg. *heṭṭhi*.

22.14. In normal Skt., ordinals from the cardinal tens, *viṃśati* etc., use *tama* rather than *ma*. But in MIndic, *ma* is used instead, affixed to stems in *i*: Pali *vīsatima*, *tiṃsatima*, etc. This usage is reflected in a few late Skt. forms, such as *triṃśatima*, *saptatima*, *navatima* (Wackernagel-Debrunner III.409). In BHS I have noted *ekanavatima*, '91st', and several blend-forms in which *ima* has been affixed by 'clipping' to stems which did not end in *i*, under the influence of such forms: *pañcāśima* '50th' (cf. § 19.36), *śatima* (Pali also *satima*) '100th', and *sahasrima* (Pali *sahassima*) '1000th'.

22.15. This same *ima* also forms contrastive adjectives, being applicable to stems not ending in *i*, originally without doubt by analogy of forms in stem-final *i* plus *ma*. This seems to me indicated by Skt. *paścima* (common) and *antima* (rare), both 'last', which I believe were formed in imitation of their antonym *ādi-ma*, 'first' (perhaps RV. *agrimá* 'first' also belongs here); no base **paści-* exists, but only *paścā(t)*, and *antima* is certainly a derivative of *anta* 'end', not of the old adverb *anti*. This usage spread in MIndic. So we find BHS *adharima*, 'lowest', to Skt. *adhara*; *abhyantarima* = Pali *abbhan°*, to *abhyantara*; *upariṣṭima* = Pali *upariṭṭhima*, cf. Skt. *upariṣṭāt*; *pārima* (Pali id.), 'further' (only applied to words for 'bank, shore'), from Skt. *pāra* 'further shore', and its opposite *a-pārima*; *purastima* (Pali *puratthima*), 'eastern', to Skt. *purastāt*, BHS *purasta*, *purastataḥ*, adv., Pali *puratthaṃ*; *purima* (Pali id.), also °*maka*, 'eastern, fore, front', likewise 'former, ancient, first', respectively to Skt. *puras* and *purā* or MIndic equivalents, cf. BHS *pure* (Pali id.) and m.c. *puri*; *pratyantima* (Pali *paccantima*), 'of the border, frontier', to Skt. *pratyanta*. There is also a non-contrastive adjective *saṃcārima* (AMg. id.), 'moving, movable', to Skt. *saṃcāra*, which resembles the Skt. forms cited in Whitney 1224a and may perhaps be based on one or another of them, or on their general pattern.

22.16. Finally, as in MIndic, we find a number of forms in which Skt. contrastive adjectives in (*a*-)*ma* replace the vowel *a* before *ma* by *i*; cf. Geiger 19.1, Pischel 101, 602. I do not believe with these scholars that this is a regular phonemic change, determined by original accentual conditions. Rather, these forms illustrate the further spread of *ima* as contrastive suffix. They are adapted to imitate the endings of such forms as Skt. *paścima*, BHS and MIndic *pārima*, *purima*, etc. The cases noted are *uttima* (Pkt. id., Pali with Skt. *uttama*), 'highest'; *katima* (Pali id., Māhārāṣṭrī *kaima*), 'which (of several)?' for Skt. *katama* (not to *kati*); *carima* and °*maka* (Pali id., both), 'last', for Skt. *carama*; *madhyima* (Pali *majjhima*), 'middle, middling', for Skt. *madhyama*, and (with MIndic consonantism) *anumajjhima* (Pali id.). Once *parima* is recorded, but it is clearly a corruption for *pārima*, above (not = Pali *parima*, Skt. *parama*).

Suffix *ila*

22.17. This secondary suffix (cf. Whitney 1227a; Pischel 595) occurs in a few adjectives unknown to Skt.; it seems to be fundamentally MIndic: *kuṣṭhila* 'leprous', to *kuṣṭha*; *sukhila* and *duḥkhila*(*-lā*), to *sukha* and *duḥkha*.

Suffix *īka*

22.18. A secondary suffix of this form, with the vṛddhi of secondary derivation, occurs in *śailika*, 'made of stone' (in a verse, but metrically indifferent), to Skt. *śilā*. Cf. Whitney 1186c (but these forms are hardly comparable).

Suffix *īna*

22.19. The word *śālīna* occurs as an adj., epithet of *odana*, 'porridge'. Its derivation is not certain, see Dict.; it seems to mean 'rich, fine'.

Suffix *īya* (*anīya*)

22.20. The suffix *īya* is still alive in BHS, making new formations unknown to Skt., not only gerundives in *an-īya*, but others. Some of the latter, tho based on nouns in *ana*, can hardly be called gerundives; some are not based on such nouns at all. The use of the suffix does not differ in principle from that of Skt. as described in Whitney 1215. The forms have meanings like 'connected with, characterized by, conducive to' whatever the primary noun means. Sometimes they interchange with equivalent stems in *ika* (*-yānīya* = *-yānika*; *āveṇīya* for usual *āveṇika*). So far as I have noted, BHS shows more extension of the *īya* suffix than any MIndic dialect. For example, BHS *-bhāgīya* does not seem to occur elsewhere, and is represented in Pali by *-bhāgiya*; *-yānīya* corresponds to Pali *-yāniya* or *-yānika* (not, or course, used in the same sense as BHS *-yānīya*). Should *sahīya*, 'associated' be classed here? In § 34.23 will be found cited from LV 52.6 ff. and 411.8 ff. a list of (*an*)*īya* formations, some but not all of which may be called gerundives. Among them is *premaṇīya* 'lovely', which is fairly common and which might be analyzed as *preman-* plus *īya*. We find also *kṣemaṇīya* 'healthy' (and as noun 'weal'?), which must be somehow connected with *kṣema* 'weal, comfort', perhaps blended with *kṣamaṇīya*, q.v. in Dict.; another possible guess would be that it imitates *premaṇīya*. See further, in Dict., *anutapyanīya*, *katīya*, *kutsanīya*, *jananīya*, *jātijarāmaraṇīya*, *-tīrīya-ka*, *parāyaṇīya*, *bhīṣaṇīya*, *rajanīya*, *vartmīya*, *vijñāpanīya*, *śrāvakīya*, *saṃvartanīya*, *saṃharṣaṇīya*, *harṣaṇīya*.

Suffix *ka* (see also *aka*)

22.21. New adjective formations in *ka*, of the type referred to in Whitney 1222c, are extremely rare. I have noted *śrāmaṇaka* (= Pali *sām°*; with vṛddhi), 'monkish', and possibly *sthitika* (= Pali *ṭhitika*), 'characterized by stability' (but this latter is perhaps better analyzed otherwise, see Dict. s.v.); perhaps *saumanasyaka* (next paragraph).

22.22. One or two peculiar uses of the suffix have been erroneously alleged. Senart i.522 on Mv i.182.15 claims an abstract-forming force. But his *saumanasyaka*, if a noun, = Skt. *saumanasya* (if an adjective, see Dict., it belongs to the preceding paragraph); *kiṃkaraṇīyaka* Mv i.211.3 = Pali and BHS *kiṃkaraṇīya*; and his other examples are all explainable without recourse to such a theory. Again, in i.557, on Mv i.232.7, Senart assumes that *ka* has specifically future meaning; but *āgataka* here is an instance of 'specifying *ka*', § 22.39, and I find no evidence to support Senart's theory.

22.23. ka svārthe. Most of the BHS *ka*-formations, not recorded for Skt., belong to *ka svārthe*, that is, used in the same meaning as the primary word to which *ka* was added. This usage is well recognized in Skt., and is still commoner in Pali and Pkt. (in the latter, the suffix usually appears by phonetic change as *ya* or *a*, rarely *ga* or even *ka*).

22.24. Use was certainly made of this practice for metrical purposes in verse, not only in BHS but also in Skt. Many of our examples are from verses, and these could be assumed to be m.c. But prose examples are also extremely common. It has not seemed to me worth while

to separate them systematically; certainly meter is not primarily the reason for the extensive use of such forms. It may, however, be noted that in a few cases forms which regularly end in *ka* seem to be used without *ka*, possibly for the sake of meter: *yamānta* = regular *yamāntaka*, repeatedly in Mmk; *keśoṇḍu* = *keśoṇḍuka*, and *śivapathī* = *śivapathikā*, each once in Laṅk; *asecana* for °*naka*; *iṣṭā* = *iṣṭakā*.

22.25. Strange is Mv i.181.18 *tāṃ yācamānāṃ prāñjalikāṃ*, the first half of a śloka line; to be sure, *prāñjalīṃ* in itself would not be as good, metrically, as *prāñjalikāṃ* in this position; but since five syllables precede, the addition of the suffix makes the line as a whole hypermetric and decidedly bad.

22.26. The following examples of *ka svārthe*, not an exhaustive list, are taken from my Dictionary. Nouns: *ajinaka, antevāsika, aśruka, āsanaka, upakaṇṭhaka, kandaraka, kiṃkaraṇīyaka, kauśalyaka, khalaka, gatikā, gṛhapatika, cīvaraka, caityaka, jñātika, dukūlaka, dvīpaka, palāśaka, piṇḍāraka* (plant name), *pīṭaka, prāsādaka, plīhaka, balaka, bhājanaka, laṇḍaka, vedayitṛka, śreṣṭhika, sakhikā* (endearing dim.?), *sārathika, sārthavāhaka, sūkarikā, svāmika*.

22.27. Adjectives, general, uncompounded: *acintyaka, īrṣyāluka, kevalaka, g(i)lānaka, jīrṇaka* (pitying dim.?), *didṛkṣuka, dīrghaka, duṣkaraka, paścimaka, pāṭalaka, pṛthuka, pradarśanaka, pradīrghaka, balika, vartulaka, vāmaka, viduṣaka, śītaka, śītalaka* (also as noun), *śūnyaka, śobhanaka, śreṣṭhaka, sarvaka, sūcanaka, saumyaka, sauvarṇaka*.

22.28. Comparatives in *tara*: *utkṛṣṭataraka, udārataraka* (see AsP 373.3 ff., prose, for a group of such forms), *ciratarakena* (adv.), *jyeṣṭhataraka* (°*ikā*), *dṛḍhapraharaṇataraka, nihīnataraka*, (*prativiśiṣṭataraka* § 22.39,) *bahutaraka, vṛddhataraka, śūrataraka*.

22.29. Present active participles in BHS frequently take extensions in *a*; to this *a* our *ka svārthe* may be added (and once, if the text is right, *i* is substituted for this *a*): *gacchantaka, jīvantaka, tiṣṭhantika* (? for expected °*aka*), *dadantaka* (°*ikā*), *nudantaka, rodantaka*.

Present middle participles: *gacchamānaka, bhāṣamānaka* (°*ikā*).

Gerundive: *roditavyaka*.

Past passive participles: *a-jātaka, atītaka, adhirūḍhaka, abhiyuktaka, abhirucitaka, āgataka, āmuktaka, āsannaka, niṣaṇṇaka, pramattaka, pramuktaka, prākṛtaka, mūrchitaka, mrakṣitaka, labdhaka, likhitaka, vinyastaka, saṃsaktaka* (pej.?), *saṃprasuptaka, saṃmūḍhaka, sahitaka, suptaka* (°*ikā*), *sthitaka*.

22.30. This 'meaningless' *ka* is specially common at the end of bahuvrīhi compounds, even in Skt. The following do not seem to be recorded in Skt.: *-āgatika, -ācāryaka, -ādharṣaka, -āpattika, -ālambaka, -indraka, -utpattika, (nir)-upādātṛka, -upāhanaka, -ullocaka, -ṛddhika, -ojaska, -kṛtyaka, -kṣāntika, -gatika, -cittaka, -daśaka* (*daśā* 'fringe'), *-dṛṣṭika, -dravyaka, -nemika, -parṣatka, -pradharṣaka, -buddhaka, -buddhika, -brāhmaṇaka, -bhāryāka, -māraka, -mūrdhaka, -vijñaptika, -vijñānaka, (Hiraṇyadhanya)-śirika* (v.l. *-śirīka*; from *śrī*), *-sūcika, -sainyaka, -svabhāvaka*.

22.31. Indeclinable: *kadācikāt* = *kadācit*, Mmk 340.12 (verse); *bhavet kadācikāt siddhiḥ*, 'success may sometimes ensue'. Perhaps merely m.c.; or quasi-diminutive, see Dict.

22.32. Diminutive ka. Very hard to distinguish clearly from *ka svārthe* is the use of the same suffix in various shades of diminutive meaning. The same is true of Sanskrit. As usual I quote here only words not found recorded in Skt. in the same meanings. It may be that a number of cases conservatively listed by me under *ka svārthe* really had diminutive meaning of some kind. In general I have included here only what seem to me fairly clear cases; but the interpretation is necessarily subjective.

22.33. Simple diminutives, without any very special emotional tinge, may be seen in *gharakehi* Mv i.22.10 (prose) 'in little huts' (so Senart); *rathaka* 'toy-cart', also *aśvaka, hastika*, 'toy-horse, -elephant'; *stūpaka*.

22.34. In the numerous *ka*-forms which decorate the verses LV 321.19 ff., verses spoken by the daughters of Māra in their attempt to seduce the Bodhisattva, it seems reasonable to see endearing diminutives. They are applied to all sorts of nouns and adjectives; not only to the speakers themselves and the Bodhisattva, but to the spring season (321.19), and in short to everything concerned in what they hope to make into an amorous situation. In the ten stanzas the following occur (in Lefm.'s readings): *su-vasantake, āgatake, phullitapādapake, suśobhanake, citritake, su-saṃsthitikāḥ, su-saṃtutikāḥ, su-yauvanikaṃ, mānasakaṃ, su-(a)laṃkṛtikā, āgatikā, sositajīvitako* (this form perhaps pitying dim.?), *-gandhinikā, -ānanikā* (three times, 322.10, 11, 13), *-su-locanikā, (-nibh-)ādharikā* (*adhara*), *-dantinikā, rati-lālasikāṃ, udgatikāṃ, su-sundarikāṃ, su-vittharikāṃ, su-kāminikāṃ, -ūruṇikāṃ* (see § 22.45), *-bāhanikāṃ* (or *-bāhun*°), *-su-maṇḍitikāṃ, dāsinikāṃ, -gāminikāṃ, -bhāsinikāṃ* (read *-bhāṣ*°), *-su-bhūṣiṇikāṃ, su-paṇḍitikāṃ, -su-sikṣitikāṃ* (°*śikṣ*°), *-su-rūpiṇikāṃ, -su-lālasikāṃ, su-vañcitako* (pitying?), *ajānaku* and *ajānanako* (pitying?), *āgatiko* (323.14, read °*kāṃ*), *kāminikāṃ*: forty cases. An average of four *ka*-forms per stanza is not likely to be accidental or meaningless.

22.35. Probably *bhadraka* Divy 38.15, 23, 30, *snigdhaka* 16, and *snehaka* 24, 31, are affectionate diminutives in tone: 'good, kindly, affectionate, gentle'. With change to *-ika*, *Pūrṇika* and *Supūrṇika* are hypocoristic diminutives of *Pūrṇamukha* (2 in Dict.), MSV ii.105.4.

22.36. The pitying diminutive, associated with affection, was exemplified several times above. It may be present also in Mv ii.173.10 *so asmākaṃ ekaputrako kālagato*, 'our one poor dear son is dead'. Pitying force seems also present in *duḥkhitaka* Divy 84.1; 86.22; *bubhukṣitaka*, 'hungry (poor fellow!)' Divy 88.7; *muṣitaka* 'miserably robbed' Divy 175.23; probably also in Divy 334.1, 3 *utpāṇḍūtpāṇḍukaḥ kṛśāluko durbalako mlānako* (similarly Divy 571.11, 18, 20, 21, in 11 omitting the first word, in other instances reading *durbalo* and/or *mlāno*; in 334.1 mss. *kṛśālako*, which is the reading Mvy 8812); possibly also *nagnakā* (of ghosts, *preta*) Mv i.28.8; *jīvantikā* Mv i.353.19 '(abandoned) alive (poor creature!)'.

22.37. A clear case of pejorative *ka* is *sahāyaka* in AsP 417.20 ff., 'inferior companion', contrasting with *pratirūpaḥ sahāyo*, 'a suitable companion', see Dict. Similarly Gv 500.5 (prose) *śrāvakapratyekabuddha-kācamaṇikān*, 'wretched glass jewels', contrasted with *sarvajñatācittotpādānarghamahāmaṇiratna-* (lines 2–3); LV 326.21 *kiṃ muniveṣakena bhavato*, 'of what use to you is an ascetic's wretched garb?'; *muṇḍaka śramaṇaka*, 'wretched shaveling monk' (Dict.); *kṛṣṇaka*, °*ṇikā*, '(repulsively) black' (of complexions; definitely derogatory); perhaps *paribhūtaka* 'wretchedly despised'; *asāraka*, 'worthless, empty, vain'; *atiriktaka*, 'quite empty' (with contemptuous implication).

22.38. Specifying ka. In quite a number of cases I am certain that the *ka*-suffix adds to the primary word a sense of individual specificity or definiteness: something like 'the one who is'. The same usage is found in Pali, e. g. Jāt. i.222.3 *macchānaṃ cintanaka-bako nāma*, 'such a thing as a heron that is one who concerns himself about (the welfare of) fish'. I have not observed this usage in Skt. It is, indeed, the one and only clear extension of the use of the suffix *ka* known to me in BHS (and Middle Indic).

22.39. It is often used in a supplementary reference to a condition previously mentioned; at the first mention of it, the same form without *ka* may be used. A good BHS

example is Mmk 82.25–26: *sarvāmānuṣaduṣṭadāruṇa-gṛhīteṣu ātmano hastam aṣṭaśatābhimantritaṃ kṛtvā gṛhītakaṃ mastake spṛśet; svastho bhavati*, 'in the case of people seized (possessed, by demons, *gṛhīteṣu*) ... one should touch the possessed person (*gṛhītakaṃ*) ... on the head, and he will get well'. Also *nāgarājā ... ahituṇḍikena gṛhītako, taṃ ānetha* Mv ii.179.9, 'the nāga-king, the one that has been captured ..., him bring'. Similarly *nirmitakā(v)* KP 142.4; 143.4 ff., 'the two ones that had been fashioned by magic' (as previously described in 141); *samyaksaṃbuddhena yo nirmitako nirmito* AsP 442.15, 'a magically created individual that has been magically created by a Buddha'; *sa nirmitako yasya kṛtyasya kṛtaso* (= °*śo*) *nirmitas tat kṛtyaṃ karoti* ibid. 443.1, 'that magically created one (form; *nirmitako*) does the act for the sake of which he was magically created (*nirmito*)'; others in Dict. s.v. *nirmitaka*. Similarly Mv i.353.12–13 *sā śākyakanyā guhāyaṃ nihitikā*, 'the Śākya-girl that had been put away in the cave' (as described in 352.21); in i.353.13 *taṃ pāṃśurāśiṃ pādena apakarṣitaṃ*, but in 15 *tat pāṃśu apakarṣitakaṃ dṛṣṭvā*, 'seeing that dirt which had been removed'. Others (see Dict.): *anuparī(t)taka, anupradattaka, āgataka* (Mv i.232.7), *ābaddhaka, āhataka, uddiṣṭaka*(?), *upaniṣaṇṇaka, kāritaka*(?), *khāditaka, gataka, glānaka, dattaka, daṣṭaka, nimantritaka, niyuktaka* (?), *niryātitaka, purimaka, prajñaptaka, pratipannaka, pratipāditaka, prativiśiṣṭataraka, pratyuptikā*(?), *prathamaka, praviṣṭaka, pravṛttaka, vṛddhataraka, śayitaka, saṃpannaka, siddhaka, sthāpitaka*. It is possible that some other cases, listed by me under *ka svārthe* above, may really belong here. Like the diminutive *ka*, this usage is not always easy to distinguish, and at times the distinction is bound to seem subjective.

Suffix *tara*

22.40. The suffix *tara*, in Skt. comparative, is used in BHS as superlative. Perhaps this use began with *anyatara*, which in BHS commonly means 'other' or 'one' of more than two (= Skt. *anyatama*), and *katara* 'which' of more than two (= Skt. *katama*). But once, at least, other adjectives in *tara* are used with definitely superlative meaning: *kumārāṇāṃ darśanīyataro prāsādikataro* Mv ii.446.9, 'the handsomest and most attractive of the (500) princes'.

Suffix *tā*

22.41. The abstract-forming suffix *tā* may be added in BHS to nouns which are themselves abstract, so that there is no change of meaning. (The same occurs in Pali; to the common abstract *issariya*, nt., 'lordship', is formed also *issariya-tā*, id.) It is specially common after nouns in *-ana*. Attention may be called particularly to the *dharmālokamukha* section of LV (31.8–36.5), which contains many such forms. To be sure, a good many, perhaps most, of the forms in this section occur at the end of compounds, and it would often be possible to interpret them as abstracts in which *-tā* is added to a Bahuvrīhi compound. For example, *amoghadarsanatā* 32.17 is probably better analyzed as *amoghadarśana* plus *tā*, 'state of having unfailing vision', rather than as *amogha* plus *darśanatā* = *darśana*. But this section, like others, contains some forms where this interpretation is impossible, e. g. *jñānatā* 32.18; *arthanatā* LV 393.13, which are not at the end of compounds. And the usage is confirmed by the fact that *tā* is added to other abstracts than those in *ana*, often not at the end of compounds. While, therefore, some of the following list may be better interpreted in the alternative way just mentioned, anyone who looks up the occurrences (all listed in Dict.) will have no doubt of the real and frequent use of *tā* 'svārthe' after abstract noun stems.

22.42. The following cases occur after *ana* stems: *adhivāsanatā, adhyavasānatā, adhyālambanatā, anubodhanatā, anubhavanatā, anurakṣaṇatā, anulomanatā, anuvartanatā, apakarṣaṇatā, (an-)abhiniveśanatā, abhibhāvanatā, abhimanyanatā, abhiśraddadhānatā, arthanatā, avanāmanatā* (? see s.v. *unnāma*), *avamanyanatā, ākarṣaṇatā, ākramaṇatā, ādhāraṇatā, āsanatā, āharaṇatā, (an-)utkarṣaṇatā, jugupsanatā, jñānatā, darśanatā* (? see above), *deśanatā, parijñānatā*(?), *(a-)paritasyanatā, paripācanatā, parivarjanatā, pratiśaraṇatā* (? LV 32.11, 33.2), *pratyavekṣaṇatā, pravartanatā, prasādanatā, bhāvanatā, yācanatā, vartanatā, vidhamanatā, (a)vimardanatā, (a)visaṃvādanatā, (a)śraddadhānatā, saṃdarśanatā, (a)saṃdhūkṣaṇatā, saṃprakāśanatā, sevanatā*.

22.43. In the same way *tā* is added to other, miscellaneous abstract nouns, without changing the meaning so far as I can see: *avidyatā* (= *avidyā*), *ādhipateyatā, kāruṇyatā, khedatā* 'lassitude' (= *kheda*), *gauravatā*(?), *tṛptitā* 'satiation', *dainyatā, daurmanasyatā*; probably also *hiṃsatā* (= *hiṃsā*).

Suffix *tha*, or *atha*

22.44. This primary suffix is used precisely as in Skt. (Whitney 1163c), forming nouns of action. It seems to have remained productive in MIndic; most of the new forms noted in BHS are paralleled in Pali: *klamatha* (Pali *kilamatha*), 'fatigue'; *damatha* (Pali id.), 'control'; *vadatha* (unknown elsewhere), 'speech'; *vanatha* (Pali id.), 'desire'; *śamatha* (Pali *sa*°), 'tranquillity'.

Suffix *nikā*

22.45. Several times in the passage LV 321.19 ff., referred to above § 22.34, we find (included in the list l.c.) feminine forms in suffixal *nikā*, used like the adjoining *ka*-words with endearing diminutive force: *-ūruṇikā*, 'having ... thighs', to *ūru*; *-bāhanikā* or *-bāhunikā*, 'having ... arms'; *dāsinikā* = *dāsī*, 'female slave'. They seem to be formed by 'clipping', in imitation of fem. forms in *(i)nikā*, from fems. in *-inī* to masc. stems in *-in*; the context contains quite a number of such, as *-gandhinikā, -dantinikā, kāminikā*.

Suffix *ma*, see Suffix *(i)ma*

Suffix *mant*, see Suffixes *vant* and *mant*

Suffix *maya*

22.46. This suffix, in Skt. denoting material, 'made of', occurs once in a peculiar meaning, 'made, performed by', in *strī-maya*, (with *tūrya*, 'instrumental music'), 'made, played by women'.

Suffix *min*, see Suffix *vin*

Suffix *la* (and *laka*)

22.47. On the basis of AMg. *hatthala*, 'thief', I assume that *hastalaḥ* should be read for the corrupt *hantulaḥ, hastulaḥ*, of Divy 646.21. It seems to derive from *hasta* with suffix *la*, 'handy' in a curious pejorative sense, probably originally slang. In *potalaka*, °*ikā*, 'young (of an animal)', = Skt. *pota(ka)*, we may have a simple diminutive use of *la(ka)*; but cf. AMg. *poāla, poyāla*, same meaning, and *go-potālikā* in BR 7.1740; also Suffix *āra*, § 22.11.

Suffixes *vant* and *mant*

22.48. The suffix *mant* seems to be added to an *in*-stem without change of meaning in *(artha-, bhūta-)darśimant*; cf. Pali *(attha-)dassima(t)*, CPD, the same word. Senart's note on Mv i.184.16 is misleading. He says that both Skt. and Pali have only *darśivant*. It is doubtful whether either has any form of that stem. The Skt. *darśivān*, n. sg. (only form recorded), is derived by BR from *darśivāṃs-*; and Pali probably has no *dassivā* at all (some

editions read *bhaya-dassivā* Dhp. 31, but others °*dassi vā*, which seems more likely), and certainly no other form of **dassiva(t)*. Whether the *i* in *putrimant* (= Pali *putti*°), Mv iii.417.15 (in a verse = Pali Sn 33), is in some way due to the influence of *darśimant*, or of other (Skt.) stems in *mant* preceded by *i*-, may be doubtful; in any case I cannot accept Geiger's theory (19.1) that *i* is a phonetic change from *a*.

22.49. The suffix *vant* is substituted for regular Skt. *mant* in *bhānuvant* LV 357.9, and in *mativanta subuddhivanto* LV 299.7 (vs), immediately following *pratibhānavanta*, and perhaps influenced by it. Note, however, Ap. *maivanta* and *vuddhivanta*, Jacobi, Bhav., Glossar.

22.50. Like *mant* in *darśimant*, above, a few forms in *vant* seem to be equivalent in meaning to the primary word without *vant*. Very common is *sarvāvant* 'entire' = Pali *sabbāva(t)*; but it is not quite equivalent to *sarva*. Kern SBE 21, xvii cites it as occurring in ŚB 14.7.1.10 (= BṛhU 4.3.10); but there it means rather 'containing everything' and is a regular *vant* formation, not in the least equivalent to the BHS and Pali form. In SP 341.10 *aṣṭavat*- (in cpd.) seems = *aṣṭa* 'eight'. In LV 283.7, repeated in 19 (vs), *arhavant* = *arhant*; there is no v.l. In several Gv prose passages we find forms in -*vatī* (fem.; sometimes written -*vati*, perhaps by mere textual corruption), apparently without change in the meaning of the primary noun: *abhijñāvatī* apparently = *abhijñā*; -*sīmāvati*- (read °*vatī*°? = *sīmā*); *sarvadharma-sāgaravati*- (apparently = °*sāgara*; read °*vatī*?)-*garbheṇa*. Note that in the last the underlying noun is masc.

Suffix *vin* (or *āvin*), and *min*

22.51. The suffix *vin*, before which stem-final *a* is regularly lengthened (often also in Skt., Whitney 1232b), has a productive life in BHS as in Pali; it is particularly (tho not exclusively) added to past participles in *ta*, in such a way that -*tāvin* takes the place of Skt. -*tavant*, also as a sort of periphrastic perfect. (It may be noted that LV 101.13, 136.16, prose, Sanskritizes regular BHS and Pali *vijitāvin* into *vijitavant*; similarly Laṅk 241.3 *caritavant* = *caritāvin*.) In a number of cases the same words found here are also found in Pali. So far as I can find, no such usage is recorded in Pkt. The forms noted are: after pple. stems in *ta*, *anujñātāvin*, *abhisamitāvin*, *ājñātāvin* (Pali *aññā*°), *kṛtāvin* (Pali *kat*°), *caritāvin*, *parijñātāvin* (Pali *pariññātāvin*), *paryupāsitāvin*, *bhuktāvin* (Pali *bhuttāvin*), *rutāvin*, *vijitāvin* (Pali id.), *śamitāvin* (Pali *sam*°, so also BHS as n. pr.), *śrutāvin*; other forms, *aghāvin* (Pali id.), *darśāvin* (Pali *dassāvin*; common both here and in Pali). Once a form in *min* replaces a regular Skt. form in *vin*: *sragmin*, thrice in Mmk (Dict.), 'garlanded', for *sragvin*.

23. Noun and verb compounds

Dual dvandvas

23.1. Dual dvandvas, like other duals, are often declined as plurals: *mātāpitṝṇām* LV 231.17 'of (my) father and mother'; *candrasūryāṇām* LV 310.21 'of the moon and sun' (cf. 17, just before, *candrasūryau*); *śakrabrahmāṇaḥ* LV 316.13 'Śakra and Brahman'; *candrasūryāḥ* LV 340.18; *candrasūryāṇām* LV 390.9 = Mv iii.308.19; *candrasūryehi* Mv iii.310.1.

23.2. Neuter sg. dvandvas are sometimes used tho composed of masc. and fem. nouns, and not necessarily meant collectively; plural adjectives may agree with them. So: *na hi bhūyu mātṛpitṛ drakṣyati putradārāṃ* LV 190.20, 'he will not see again mother or father, son or wife'; *mātāpitṛ nitya varṇitā* (so divide) *pūjanīyāḥ* (mss., Lefm. em. °*nīyāḥ*) LV 235.14, 'mother and father are declared to be always worthy of reverence'; *chandaka-kālodāyi* Mv iii.91.14 (prose), 'Chandaka and Kālodāyin', here nom. sg.; same as voc. sg. iii.91.16; 92.3. Note also *mātāpitaraṃ*, nom., Bbh 389.20 (prose); cf. next paragraph.

23.3. But, as in non-standard Skt. (Wackernagel II. 1 § 70), a singular dvandva may also have the gender and inflection of the last component: *ārohapariṇāho* . . . °*phalopetaḥ* SP 246.8 (prose), 'the height and circumference were provided with . . . fruits'; *hiri-dhṛtī-kāruṇyamaitryā* (so read, 4-member dvandva, instr. sg. fem.) LV 292.17; *candrāsūryaś ca* LV 316.13; *mātāpitaraṃ* acc. sg., Mv i.109.1; ii.211.17; 212.2, 3; Gv 520.23; *ambātāto* Mv i.181.3 (with sg. verb); *caṭita-sphuṭitakaḥ prādurbhūtaḥ* Divy 22.27 'cracks and fissures appeared' (but in 23.6 the more normal *caṭitasphuṭitakāni prādurbhūtāni*); *uccāraprasrāvaḥ* Divy 194.15 'dung and urine'; *dhanuṣkalāpakaḥ* Mvy 5005, 'bow and quiver (of arrows)'; *aja-r-eḍake* (Dict.). A common dvandva of this type is *avavādānuśāsanī*; see Dict. s.v. *avavāda*.

23.4. Contrariwise, note the nt. pl. *mātāpitṝṇi* (mss. °*tṛṇi*) Mv ii.173.17; *nānādrumaṃ aśokātimuktacampakapriyaṅguśālāni* iii.79.20 (vs).

Inflected forms as prior members

23.5. A prior member sometimes appears in the nom. dual or plural, instead of stem, form (cf. *āpomaya* 'made of water' ChU. 6.5 ff.): *apsarasaḥkoṭīniyutaśatasahasrasaṃgītisampracalita* LV 10.22 (*apsarasaḥ*- can only be part of the cpd.; no v.l.; not mentioned by Weller: '. . . the song of myriads . . . of apsarases'); *-varuṇavāsavāśvinaunāga-* LV 249.16 (in a long cpd. listing many deities, including 'Varuṇa, Vāsava, the Aśvins, nāgas' etc.; Lefm. leaves a space after *-āśvinau*, but the word can only be construed as part of the cpd.); *vāmadakṣiṇau-pāṇibhir* LV 295.4 (so ms. A, the best; Lefm. with other mss. *vāmadakṣiṇe*, doubtless to be understood also as dual, fem. or nt.) 'with the left and right hands' (must be cpd., tho Lefm. separates after °*ṇe*); *pañcabhir nīlavāsasoyakṣaśatair* Divy 238.23 'by 500 Nīlavāsas (-named?) yakṣas' (cpd., tho ed. separates after °*vāsaso*).

23.6. Even a bahuvrīhi may contain such a nom. pl. form as prior member: *pañcayojanaśatāny-ārohapariṇāhaṃ* . . . *siṃhāsanaṃ* SP 246.9 (prose) 'a throne having a height and circumference of 500 yojanas'. Note the gender of *āroha-pariṇāhaṃ*; it is one of a series of neuter modifiers of *siṃhāsanaṃ*; what precedes it can only be part of the same cpd.

23.7. The occasional use of nom. sg. forms as 'stems' in composition has been noted under *a*-stems, § 8.12, and *u*-stems, § 12.4. One or two sporadic cases which could be interpreted similarly may be added here; but they may also be understood as containing 'hiatus-bridging' consonants, instead of nom. sg. endings. Thus, *hrīrapatrāpya*, for more regular *hry-apatrāpya*; it occurs several times, but may contain 'hiatus-bridging' *r* (for *hrī-apa*°), see § 4.63. So also in LV 430.8, as part of a long cpd., *-śīte* (loc.) *-uṣṇodakam-uṣṇe* (loc.)-*śītodakachāyātapa* (loc.)-*ṛtusukha-paribhogānupradāna-* etc., 'gift of seasonal enjoyments in shade and sunshine, consisting of warm water in cold and cold water in heat', etc.; here *m* at the end of *uṣṇodaka-m* may be 'hiatus-bridging' *m*.

23.8. A few times, in feminine karmadhārayas, the prior member (an adjective stem) seems to be made fem. (interpretable either as stem or as nom. sg.) as if agreeing with the final member (cf. Wackernagel II.1 p. 52): *prasravantī-lālābhiḥ* LV 206.7 (prose; ignored by Weller) 'with flowing saliva'; perhaps *-viśeṣaṇā-sadṛśī-lokādhipateyatāṃ* LV 179.20 (prose; Weller 28 separates after *-dṛśī*, taking the latter as acc. sg., § 10.55); perhaps *anuttarāsamyaksambodhim abhisaṃbuddhasya* LV 439.20 (prose; Weller 39 again, as in prec., reads *anuttarā* as a separate word, acc. sg.; see § 9.21).

23.9. Compounds with inflected form (other than nom. sg., see above) as prior member, not occurring in Skt. (cf. Whitney 1267 c, 1269 b), include *śūraṃgama* (Dict.); *-svabhāvaṃsaṃdarśanavibhavacakraṃ* LV 422.19, 'wheel of destruction thru showing the nature . . .' (so apparently all mss., only Calc. *-svabhāva-saṃ*°); *-sugandhatailamūrdhnipariṣiñcanaṃ*, LV 432.15, 'sprinkling on the head with perfumed oil' (so Lefm. with best mss.; v.l. °*mūrdhna*°; in preceding line, *mūrdhnā* may be taken as separate word, tho Lefm. prints it as if cpd. with the following); perhaps *yāvat-trīṇi-varṣa-janmika*, 'up to three years old', see Dict. s.v. *janmika*.

Irregular order of parts of compounds

23.10. Cf. Whitney 1314d; not all the examples there listed are sound. Seems to occur in the following:

śītoṣṇadve vāridhāre LV 83.22 (prose) 'two streams of water, cold and hot'. So all mss., confirmed by Weller's (23); Calc. *śītoṣṇe*. The cpd. *śītoṣṇadve* is repeated in the verse account of the same incident, 93.3.

cāmaraśubhe LV 84.18 (prose) = *śubhe cāmare*. Not noted by Weller.

ṛṣijīrṇo LV 102.12 (prose); Weller 24 implausibly suggests separating *ṛṣi*, as MIndic nom. sg.

? *marud-viśuddhā(ḥ)*, for *viśuddha-* (or *viśuddhāḥ*) *marutāḥ* LV 113.19 (vs); but see § 15.16.

sarveyaṃ pṛthivī prakampita-m-abhūc śailā (so Lefm.) *sakūṭāvatī* LV 194.9 (vs) (read °*vatī* with v.l.); I can only understand *śailāsakūṭāvatī* as a cpd. (*śailā-* for *śaila-*, m.c.), 'all this earth including the mountains-along-with-their-peaks . . .'; normal order *sakūṭa-śailāvatī*. Tib. sup-

ports this mg.: *sa ḥdi thams cad rtse mor ldan paḥi ri daṅ bcas te gyos par gyur.*

gandharvabahubhiḥ Mv i.145.6 (vs) (Senart em. °*bhi*, m.c.) 'by many gandharvas'.

Adjectives agreeing in sense with prior member

23.11. Sometimes an adjective agrees, rather bizarrely, with a prior member of a cpd.: *sadevamānuṣāsurasya lokānukampām upādāya* LV 6.20–21, 'taking pity on the world consisting of gods . . .', as if *lokasya* were read (Weller 15); *cāsya* (! delete preceding punctuation?) *putrasahasraṃ bhavati śūrāṇāṃ vīrāṇāṃ* etc. (sc. *putrāṇāṃ*) LV 18.6; closely similar are LV 101.16–17; 136.19; and Mv i.193.17–18; *patnīśuddho 'parikṛṣṭasaṃpannāyāḥ* (sc. *patnyāḥ*) LV 26.6–7; *ādīpta sarvatribhavaṃ tribhir agnitaptaṃ, saṃkalparāgaviṣayāraṇiucchritena* (so, one word) LV 116.13–14 (vs), 'the whole triple world is aflame, blazing with the three fires (sc. *agnibhiḥ*, in *agni-*), increased (sc. *agninā*, in the same, here understood as a collective unit, cf. § 5.5) by (or, arisen from) the firesticks of . . .'; *tāsāṃ* (sc. *strīṇāṃ*) *caturaśīteḥ* (so read, Weller 27) *strīsahasrāṇāṃ* LV 157.8; *pañcasu kaṣāyakāle* LV 257.21, 'in the time of the five corruptions', the numeral here attracted to the case of *-kāle* tho agreeing in sense with *kaṣāya-*; *lokottareṣu catusatyapathe vidhijño* LV 125.1, 'knowing the rules in the sphere of the Four Truths, (in the Truths) which are superworldly' (again with attraction of case to that of *-pathe*); *so cittadhāra jagatāṃ vividhā vicitrā* (sc. *cittāni*) LV 125.9, 'he holds firmly the thoughts, various and manifold, of creatures'; *jñātisaṃghaparivṛtaṃ sarvai rudadbhiḥ krandadbhiḥ* etc. LV 190.10 ff., 'surrounded by a throng of relatives, all weeping' etc. (some inferior mss. °*saṃghaiḥ pari*°); *triṃśadbuddhakoṭiyo śākyamunināmadheyānāṃ* (sc. *buddhānāṃ*) Mv i.57.8, '30 crores of Buddhas named Śākyamuni'; *aṣṭau gaṅgānadīvālukāsamā bodhisattvā(ḥ)* SP 297.1 (prose), 'eight Ganges-river-sand-like Bodhisattvas' i. e. eight times as many B's as there are sands of the Ganges.

Compounds of type *phalāphala*

23.12. BHS has some compounds of the type of Pali *phalāphala* 'all manner of fruits'. Their interpretation is disputed, cf. Geiger 33.1. That they started with compounds of positive and negative forms, e. g. *phala-aphala* 'fruit and non-fruit', seems supported by *-koṭy-akoṭi-* RP 4.15 'crores upon crores', lit. 'crores and non-crores'. The others, like all noted in Pali, are ambiguous in that *a*-stems are concerned. (But *kālākāle* Śikṣ 167.1 'in and out of season' surely contains a negative second member.) Some are identical with Pali cpds.: *phalāphalam* (Pali id.) Mv ii.475.13 (prose) etc.; *kṛtyākṛtya* = Pali *kiccākicca*; also *mañcakāmañcaka, chidrāchidra, svarāsvara.*

23.13. The nearest approach to this idiom which I have found in standard Skt. is *calācala* 'unstable' (also in BHS; Śikṣ 231.4; Divy, Index), interpreted by BR (following Hindu grammatical authorities) as a primary derivative of a reduplicated form of *cal*. Tho such a reduplicated stem is otherwise unknown, this may be the true explanation. No certain case of an adjective of this type is known in Pali or BHS. In LV 193.19 (vs) *jihmājihma* '(very) depressed' may have *ā* m.c., or *jihmā* may be an independent nom. pl.

23.14. In LV 234.21 (vs; by Lefm.'s em., m.c., for *rasa-rasāgra*), and elsewhere (Dict.), there is trace of a form *rasārasāgra*; but probably *rasa-rasāgra* is the true form (Dict. s.v. *rasāgra*).

Verb compounds

23.15. The strange form *sātmy eva bhavanti* Jm 95.9 (vs), 'become quite habitual' (for *sātmībhavanty eva*), is without parallel. It is noted by Renou, Gr. scte. p. 152, referring to Franke, IFAnzeiger 5.33.

23.16. In one passage, Av i.223.11, we seem to have a clear case of Vedic 'tmesis', separation of a preverb from its verb; *na tāvad ut te lekhā laṅghayitavyā*, 'you must not cross over the line' (for *ul-laṅghayitavyā*). So Speyer interprets, and I see no other possibility.

23.17. As occasionally in Skt. (Renou, Gr. scte. p. 175), *a* privative is (rarely) compounded with finite verbs: *māṃ ca apaśyanti* SP 324.2 'and they see me not'; *anatikramāmo* Mv ii.80.8 'we do not transgress'; *sā dāni strī dharmalabdhena anicchiyati* (mss. *anicchayanti, anicheyati*), Mv iii.295.18, 'now this woman is not desired by Dh.' Senart assumes negative of passive, which is perhaps the simplest conjecture; the form is uncertain tho the meaning is clear.—R. Mitra, LV Calc. Introd. 35, cites (without reference) *ajanehi* 'do not cause' from LV. He doubtless refers to Calc. 293.6 = Lefm. 237.1, interpreted by Mitra as *śīghraśīghram ajanehi*, but by Lefm. (correctly, in my opinion) as *śīghraśīghra ma* (m.c. for °*ghraṃ mā*) *janehi.*

24. The verb: general remarks

24.1. In general, the entire verb system of BHS, as of all Middle Indic, is based on the present stem. This serves as 'root' for all verb forms. Cf. Geiger 120, end, and Pischel 452, end; but these writers understate the facts, laying this principle down only as a possibility (of frequent occurrence, to be sure). It is the regular process, tho it has exceptions.

24.2. That it is, as a rule, precisely the present stem, rather than any other form of the verb, which serves as base for the other forms, seems indicated by the constant use in this way of unmistakable present bases which cannot be confused with Sanskrit 'roots'. All sorts of non-present forms (and noun derivatives, see e. g. §§ 22.7, 12) are made from such stems as *paśya-*, *manya-*, *iccha-*, *sīda-*, *tiṣṭha-*, *jaha-*, which originally existed only in the present system; also from Skt. passive stems in *-ya-*, etc. It is true that other forms, notably past passive participles (in *-ita-*) and futures, were also concerned in new verb formations. But generally they seem to have operated by first creating new present stems, which then served as bases for other verb forms.

24.3. In Chapter 28 I shall try to classify the non-Sanskritic present stems of BHS, noting the various ways in which they seem to have originated, where possible. The great majority are thematic presents, that is, stems ending in *-a-*; this *-a-* is regularly dropped before endings outside of the present system. There is also a group of forms where the present stem ends in a long vowel, most commonly *-e-*, occasionally *-ā-*, quite rarely other long vowels; these contrast with the *-a*-stems in their way of making certain non-present forms, notably the aorist. Other types of present-formation hardly exist, except as directly inherited from Sanskrit, and then as relic forms (tho some are very common).

Thematic presents

24.4. These, as we said, constitute the vast majority of verbs in the language. Many are inherited from Sanskrit; but many others do not occur, or occur only as sporadic irregularities, in standard Sanskrit. Historically, most of them can be explained by analogical processes; the origin of some remains obscure to me. Striking is the variety of the analogical processes involved, tho they all result in thematic presents. We may describe it as multiple morphologic 'drift': all the processes tend towards a like goal, but by different paths.

24.5. The regular thematic verb had a present indicative resembling the Skt. present active, with three persons in the singular and three in the plural; an optative (largely undifferentiated as to person and number), an imperative (2 and 3 person sg. and pl.), and two participles, with stems usually in *-anta-* (also *-ata-*) and *-amāna-*. Original middle forms occur, but (except the participle) seem to have been sporadic, and not differentiated in meaning from the active. Even the passive (below) commonly had active endings.

24.6. There was also a future, inflected like the present; an aorist, generally undifferentiated as to person and number (but there are distinctive 3 pl. and occasionally 1 sg., 1 pl. and 2 pl. forms); a past passive participle; a gerund (with four or five interchangeable endings); an infinitive; a gerundive; a passive (inflected more or less fully, like an independent stem); and a causative (even more completely inflected). All these, as we said, were based on the present stem.

24.7. Ignoring sporadic or more exceptional forms, for which see my treatment of each category, we may set up the following paradigm of the regular thematic verb. I choose the BHS stem *śruṇa-* 'hear'. Most, tho not all, of the forms cited actually occur from this verb.

Present indicative: sg., *śruṇāmi*, *śruṇasi*, *śruṇati*; pl., *śruṇāma(s)*, *śruṇatha*, *śruṇanti*
Optative: *śruṇe(t)*, *śruṇi*, *śruṇeya*, °*yā* (all used for all persons and both numbers)
Imperative: 2 sg. *śruṇa*, *śruṇāhi*; 3 sg. *śruṇatu*; 2 pl. *śruṇatha*; 3 pl. *śruṇantu*
Present participle: *śruṇanta-* (also *śruṇata-*), *śruṇamāna-*
Future: *śruṇiṣyati* etc. (like present)
Aorist: *śruṇi*, *śruṇī*, *śruṇe(t)* (all used for all persons and both numbers); 3 pl. also *śruṇiṣu*, *śruṇiṃsu*, *śruṇetsu(ḥ)*
Past passive participle: *śruṇita-*
Gerund: *śruṇitvā*, *śruṇitvāna*, *śruṇiya*, *śruṇiyāna*, *śruṇi*
Infinitive: *śruṇitum*
Gerundive: *śruṇitavya-*
Passive: *śruṇīyati*, *śruṇiyati* etc. (inflected even outside the present system)
Causative: *śruṇāpayati*, °*peti* etc. (inflected thruout)

Stems in long vowels

24.8. The only other productive type of verb inflection shows stems in a long vowel: most commonly *e*, frequently *ā*, more rarely *ī* or *ū* or *o*. Their regular inflection differs from that of the thematic verbs, in that they keep the long vowel before most endings. When in thematic verbs the ending begins with *-i-*, in most forms this *-i-* is replaced by, or lost after, the long vowel of the stem. (But the optative, past passive participle, passive, and causative have as a rule no distinctive forms.) So from *sthapemi* 'I place' we find impv. *sthapehi*, *-sthapetha*, etc., fut. *sthapeṣyati* etc., ger. *sthapetvā*; from *-kramemi*, inf. *-krametum*; from **graheti* (fut. *graheṣyati* etc.), gdve. *grahetavya-*. In the aorist there is the further distinction that after a long vowel the ending contains a sibilant, which is lacking in the aorist of thematic stems: *thapesī*, *-kramesi*, *-graheṣīd*, and the like. The same holds good in Pali (cf. Geiger 163, 165.2, 167) and in AMg., the only normal Pkt. which retains the aorist, tho Pischel 516 does not formulate it so.

24.9. There is some confusion between forms appropriate to the two types of verb inflexion. Especially is this true of verbs based on presents in *-eti*, many, perhaps most, of which are historically causatives and denominatives. We shall see that, as in MIndic generally, they are not infrequently paralleled by *-ati* forms, and vice versa (§§ 38.2, 3, 18 ff., 25 ff.). So it happens that our language may show e. g. a 2 sg. impv. in *-ehi*, or an aorist in *-esi*, from a verb which otherwise shows only *-ati* forms. Such cases, where they are fairly numerous, will receive special

attention in our treatment of the imperative, the aorist, or other verbal categories.

24.10. Stems in -e-. Most commonly this *-e-* is phonetically derived from Skt. *-aya-* (or *-ayi-*; from *-avi-* in fut. *bheṣyati* = *bhaviṣyati*). Probably the majority are derived from causative or denominative formations; for others see §§ 28.46 ff. We may regard the following as the regular paradigm, but nothing like a full set of forms is quotable from any verb.

Present indic. sg. *demi, desi, deti*; pl. *dema,* (*detha,*) *denti*
(Opt. indistinguishable from *-ati* forms: *-krameyā* etc.)
Impv. 2 sg. *-nehi* (cf. Skt. *dehi*); 3 sg. *detu*; pl. *detha, dentu*
Pres. pple. *oḍḍenta-*
Fut. *-dheṣyati* etc.; *bheṣyati* (for *bhaviṣyati*, special case)
Aor. *-dhesi*
(Ppp. indistinguishable from *-ati* forms, and usually from corresponding Skt. pples.; cf. *-dhita-* etc.)
Ger. *sthapetvā, -lobhetvāna*
Inf. *-krametum, -metum*
Gdve. *grahetavya-*

24.11. Stems in -ā-. These are much less common than the preceding group. In the present they follow the type of Skt. *yāti* 'goes'. Their miscellaneous origins will be summarily discussed below, §§ 28.51–55. The following forms seem to belong here:

Pres. ind. *dāmi, dāsi, pradanti* (MIndic *a* for *ā*?); *-dhāmi, -dhāti*; *prādurbhāmi* (to *bhū*); *-sthāmi, sthāti*
Impv. *bhāhi* (to *bhī*), *-sthāhi, apacāhi* (§ 28.54; on *dadāhi* cf. § 28.61); *-sthātu*; *śraddadhādhvam*
Pres. pple. *sthāt-* (weak stem)
Fut. *adattādāsyatha, jāsyate* (passive; Epic Skt. *jāsyati*), *-dadhāsyasi, -dadhāsye, svādhyāsyati*
Aor. (*a*)*kāsi* (to *kṛ*), *agāsi, adāsi* and °*sīt, udapāsi* (to *pad*!), *-bhāsi* (to *bhā*, or to *bhās* with ending *i*?), *nirvāsu, -vāṃsu, asthāsi* and °*sīt*
Ppp. *-dadhāta-, śrad-dhāta-, palāta-, palāna-*
Inf. *-dadhātum*
Gdve. *svādhyātavya-*; *-dadhānīya-*; (*duḥ-śrad-*)*dadheya-*(?)
Pass. opt. *vikrāyetsuḥ* (to *vi-krī*), fut. *vikrāyiṣyati* and *vikrāsyati* (also *jāsyate*, above); opt. *svādhyāyeta*

24.12. Stems in -ī-. Few new presents of this type in *-ī-* have been discovered. There is a form of *nī, samudānīmahe*, and a gdve. *a-vinīya*; cf. Skt. *adhīta-*: *adhīte*; on this model the ppp. *nīta-* might have created *nīte*; or, more remotely, on the model *yāta-*: *yāti* etc., and the like. On *bhavīti* (?) see Chap. 43, s.v. *bhū* (7).

Skt. has not only *adhīte* but more rarely *adhīyate*, which is regular in our language and MIndic. By analogy with this pair a future *adhīṣyati* is created, matching the regular *adhīyiṣyati*. And so fut. *patīṣyanti*, to *pa(t)tīyati*, for more usual *pattīyiṣyanti*; and with passive meaning *nīṣyati*, to present passive *nīyati* (°*te*). Cf. also *dīṣyati, tarīhasi, sthapīṣyati*, § 31.3. Similar are *allīṣyati*, fut., and *allīpayati*, caus., to more usual *allīyati*; related to Skt. *lī-*, ppp. *līna* (note BHS *allīna*). We may also note *-gṛhīṣyāmi* (also Epic Skt.), for Skt. *grahīṣyāmi*, on which (rather than on ppp. *gṛhīta-*) *-gṛhīṣyāmi* may be based (with *ṛ* for *ra*). With this future may be grouped the inf. *-gṛhītum* and gdve. *-gṛhītavya-*.

There is an aorist *abravīṣi*, evidently a modification of *abravīt* to fit this inflectional pattern; the long vowel called for the aorist ending *-si*. Similarly, perhaps, aor. *-grahīṣī*(*d*), to *grahī-*(*ṣyati*, etc.); also 3 pl. forms, based on Skt. imperfects in *īt, āsīsu* (v.l. *āsītsu*) and *abravītsu* (§ 32.37).

Gerunds are formed from weak 9th-class present stems: *abhinirmiṇīya, gṛhṇīya, gṛhṇitvā, gṛhṇīyāna*; and from weak 3d-class present stems, *abhinirmimīya, jihrīya*. From such stems other non-present forms occur. So fut., *gṛhṇīṣyati*, perhaps *krīṇīṣyati* (§ 31.7); aor. *udgṛhṇīṣu* (? § 32.37); pass. pple. *abhinirmimīyantam* (§§ 37.15, 37).

24.13. Stem in -ū-. Here I know only of forms of the root *bhū*. There is no present of this type. But Skt. had a preterite (root aorist) *abhūt*, which BHS inherits (also as *abhū, abhu, ahū* etc.). And to it was formed, presumably on the model of *adāsi* to *adā*(*t*), a new *s*-aorist *abhūṣi* (*abhūṣī*, °*ṣīt*) which is extremely common; it was obviously the regular aorist of this root in the dialect, altho not recorded in any other form of MIndic (except perhaps a few Aśokan forms, 1 sg. and 3 pl., which may be parallel, § 32.72). There is also recorded, once, a future 1 sg. *pratibhūṣyaṃ* (? possibly denominative).

24.14. Stems in -o-. Here too we find practically nothing but forms of root *bhū*; otherwise only an isolated and doubtful *-haroti* (on which see §§ 28.18, 58), an equally dubious aor. *-karosi* (§ 32.70), and *aśroṣi*, a direct MIndic inheritance from Skt. *aśrauṣīt* 'heard'.

There is a normal and very common present 3 sg. *bhoti* (= *bhavati*; 1 sg. *bhomi*, 3 pl. *bhonti*), with impv. *bhohi*; the form *hoti* (regular in Pali) also occurs but much more rarely.

To it is formed, first, a regular future *bhoṣyati* (? doubtful, and certainly much less common than *bheṣyati*; in Pali, also, *-bhossati* and *-hossati* are rare, apparently only in cpds., while *hessati* is regular, Geiger 151.3, 154.2). Further, with *h* for *sy*, fut. 2 sg. *bhohī, hohī*, 3 sg. *hohiti, hohati*, 3 pl. *hohanti*.

And there is a rare and doubtful aorist *bhosiṣu* (3 pl.; § 32.78), of the same type.

Non-thematic stems

24.15. Except for stems in long vowels, treated in the preceding sections, these exist only as relic forms inherited from Sanskrit, or virtually so. They do not spread outside of the present system. In so far as they are used in that system in a different way from Sanskrit, they will be discussed in §§ 28.57 ff.

25. Person and number

The dual

25.1. The dual was surely not alive in the language. Where it occurs, it is generally to be assumed that it has been introduced as a Sanskritism.

25.2. Plural, or sometimes singular, verb forms are used with dual nouns and pronouns. So *yuvām adya gacchathā sādhu dārakau* SP 462.8 (vs, with varr., mostly pl. verbs). In SP 267.2 (prose) ed. *abhāṣetām* (subject two persons severally named), but 3 mss. *abhāṣata*, and La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1074 *bhāṣinsuḥ* (with insertion of pronoun *te*, referring to the two subjects); in the sequel even KN use plural pronouns and verbs of the same pair. The edition prints dual verb forms in SP 249.2; 250.5; and 459.1, but all, or virtually all, mss. are recorded with either sing. or pl. forms, tho the subjects are recorded as dual in form. In SP 105.10 ff. (prose) dual nouns and pronouns are presented regularly as subjects of verbs which, in KN, are also regularly dual; sometimes the mss. seem to support such forms, to judge by the Crit. App.; but often they indicate plurals. So plural verbs with dual subjects occur in other texts, as LV 222.4 *śakro brahma ubhau ca . . . darśyanti*; Mv (vss); *duve na jāyante . . . nararṣabhau* i.122.16; *icchema pratisṛjyantau* 181.1; *ubhāv etau mariṣyanti* 181.5; *yāpenti nirmitau* 181.15; also Ud viii.1 *ubhāv etau* (ms. *atau*) *pretya samau bhavanti.*

25.3. Singular verb with dual subject (as with plural subject, below): *duve mahātmānau utpadyate tathāgatau* Mv i.122.14 (vs; one inferior ms. *utpadyante*, Senart em. °*yete*; parallel passage, line 16, reads *jāyante*, see above); *vibhāti* (*kramau*; Senart em. *vibhānti*) Mv i.68.11; *candrasūryau pated* LV 310.17; *śaśiravi* (for °*vī*) *prapate* LV 330.3; *avocat*, with dual subjects, Mv i.327.11, 18; 328.14; 329.2 (all prose); *duve . . . aṇvati* Mv ii.101.18 (prose; Senart em. °*nti*).

Confusion of person and number

25.4. There is widespread confusion of person and number, usually in that 3 sg. forms are used for any person and either number. This usage perhaps started with the optative (ending *-e*) and aorist (endings *-i*, *-ī*), where—largely by phonetic loss of endings—confusion set in in Middle Indic (cf. especially Pischel 459). Geiger 141.1 records the frequent use of *atthi* (= *asti*) with plural subject, but otherwise this usage seems to be virtually ignored in the books on Pali or Pkt. except as indicated above.

25.5. In BHS the phenomenon is specially common, indeed standard, in the optative and the aorist, where the MIndic endings *e*, *i*, *ī*, and even the Sanskritized *et*, *īt*, are used very commonly as 1 and 2 sg. and 3 pl. (rarely as 1 and 2 pl.). Much less commonly, historic 3 pl. and 1 or 2 sg. forms are used with subjects differing in person and number, especially 3 sg. Examples of these usages, with non-Skt. endings, will be found under the opt. and aor. In the following list will be included formally regular Skt. 3 sg. optatives and aorists, used with other than 3 sg. subjects.

25.6. It seems that any 3 sg. form may occasionally be used with subjects of other persons and of plural number. And to some, tho a much slighter, extent the confusion extends to other than 3 sg. forms. Some examples will now be cited, mostly from verses; prose examples will be so marked.

25.7. A special case is the use of 3 sg. verbs with vocative subjects (so sometimes in Vedic, Ved. Var. I § 332, and in late Skt., Emeneau, Jambhaladatta's Vet. xxii): *parinirvātu bhagavan parinirvātu sugata* LV 377.10 (prose; no em. needed; note in Weller 35 is otiose); *parigṛhnātu bhagavann . . .* LV 382.13, 20 (prose); *mama bhadre patiṃ varet* (mss. *car*°) Mv ii.71.5, 11 (vss), 'choose me as husband, fair one!'; *imaṃ bhagavan madhutarpaṇaṃ paribhuṃjatu* Mv iii.304.6 (prose). Cf. § 25.29.

Third singular forms

25.8. Pres. indic. with 1 sg. subject: *paśyati* Mv i.51.13 (prose; Senart em. °*āmi*, tho he keeps *adrākṣīt*, parallel, and equally 1 sg., in the preceding line); *ahaṃ . . . yujyate vā viyujyate vā* ŚsP 265.1–2 (prose); (*ahaṃ . . .*) *na vindāmi nopalabhate* ŚsP 504.3 (prose).

25.9. Pres. indic. with 2 sg. subject: *tvaṃ . . . bhavati* Divy 504.6 (prose).

25.10. Pres. indic. with 3 pl. subject: *asti* SP 58.8; 87.7; 92.1; 139.4; 363.9; 371.1; LV 235.18; Mv i.177.11; 328.8; *eti* SP 131.11 (with mss.); 307.2 (WT *enti* with K'); *deśayate* SP 359.4; *saṃjānīte* LV 60.1 (prose; v.l. °*nate*); *saṃjanayati* LV 66.21 (prose); *śrūṇute* LV 74.9; *śrūyate* LV 80.14; *saṃvidyate* LV 106.8 (prose); *bhāsate* LV 123.2; *upety* Mv i.83.17 (Senart em. °*nty*); *parityajati* Mv i.105.10 (prose; Senart em. °*nti*); *bhavati* Mv i.233.3 (prose); *śaknoti* Mv ii.45.15 (prose); 286.5 (in both these Senart em. *śaknonti*); *dṛśyate* Laṅk 8.6; *īkṣate* RP 10.14; *saṃbudhyate* RP 15.8; *tyajate* RP 16.2 (in same line, with same subject, *vicaranti*; this and the others in RP may be m.c.); *kurute* RP 31.6.

25.11. Pres. opt. with 1 sg. subject: *bhavet* SP 336.7; *tārayet* (so with all Nep. mss.) SP 336.8; *utsahet* LV 60.17 (prose; so with v.l. and Weller 20 f.); *gacched ahaṃ* LV 215.18; *bhakṣayet* Mv i.92.15; *kuryāt* Mv ii.144.9 (prose); *ahaṃ syāt* Divy 110.13 (prose); *ahaṃ bhavet* Divy 250.4 = 252.22; *jīved ahaṃ . . . paśyed ahaṃ* Divy 638.21 (prose); *ahaṃ . . . mīmānsed iti* Av i.175.17 (prose; so ms.); *praveśayed* Suv 237.11 (all mss. have *-d-*).

25.12. Pres. opt. with 2 sg. subject: *tvaṃ . . . utthihet* LV 284.6 (no v.l.); *udīrayed* Mv i.84.16; *jānīyād* Divy 284.15 (prose); *yadi tvam anujānīyād*, 'if you permit', Divy 243.12 (prose, no v.l.).

25.13. Pres. opt. with 3 pl. subject: *praviśed* Mv i.150.16; *pated* LV 284.3; *bhavet* SP 32.6; 126.9; 280.6; *likhet . . . likhāpayed vā* SP 51.4.

25.14. Imperative with 3 pl. subject: *āstāṃ* Mv i.152.5 = 225.21 = ii.29.2.

25.15. Imperative with 1 (or 3) pl. subject: *bhavatāṃ* RP 44.8.

25.16. Future with 1 sg. subject: *ahaṃ . . . abhisaṃbhotsyate* LV 269.2–3 (prose; so Lefm. with best mss.; v.l. °*tsye*); *kutrāham upaneṣyata iti* LV 118.18 (prose).

25.17. Future with 2 sg. subject: (*tvaṃ . . .*) *chetsyati* Divy 322.22 (prose).

25.18. Future with 3 pl. subject: *dāsyate* LV 12.20.

25.19. Preterite with 1 sg. subject: *āsīt* (usually with *aham* expressed) SP 28.2; 195.3; 384.8; RP 23.14; Divy 402.19 (prose); *avocat* SP 257.8 (prose); LV 238.20 (prose); 239.6, 8 (prose); Mv ii.118.7, 13, 17 (all prose); *adrākṣīt* Mv i.51.11–12; ii.123.17; iii.50.18; 75.1 (all prose); LV 265.21 (prose; v.l. °*kṣaṃ*); *ahaṃ nāśrauṣīd* Divy 422.3; *prāvikṣat* LV 240.2 (prose); *abhūt* LV 265.22 (prose, but v.l. *abhūvaṃ*); *akarod* SP 258.7; *aham adāt* Gv 427.24.

25.20. Preterite with 2 sg. subject: *mā . . . pariprākṣīt* Karmav 27.17, 21 (both prose); (*tvaṃ . . .*) *adhyāgamad* Divy 617.25 (prose).

25.21. Preterite with 1 pl. subject: *āsīt* (*vayam* expressed) SP 212.8.

25.22. Preterite with 3 pl. subject: *āsīt* SP 51.10; 176.13; 192.6; 384.5, 10; *avocat* Mv i.226.2 = ii.29.5; i.300.8 (prose); 328.7 (prose); ii.259.2 (prose); LV 4.17; 6.15 (both prose, ed. em. *avocan*); *adrākṣīt* Mv i.55.3; 56.10 (both prose); *abhūt* Mv i.193.16 (prose); ii.294.10; *kuruta* (i. e. *ak*°) LV 81.16; *akampat prākampat* etc. LV 352.2–4 (prose; a long series of verbs; subject *sarvalokadhātavo*; mss. discordant but the best ones regularly have singulars); *upasaṃkrāmad* LV 364.16; 366.12 (both prose); *abhāṣata* LV 120.8 (prose; but two mss. *abhāṣantaḥ*!); *adhyabhāṣata* RP 46.6, 12 (both prose).

25.23. Perfect with 2 sg. subject: *tvam eva so tādṛśako babhūva* SP 28.2.

25.24. Perfect with 1 pl. subject: *vayaṃ savihāraṃ dadau* Karmav 97.2. Here Lévi divides *sa vihāraṃ*, making an unspecified male person the subject of *dadau*. But this makes no sense. The obvious meaning is that 'we' (three nuns) in a former birth gave a gift which included a *vihāra*. The verse is identical with Therig. 518, where *adāsimha* confirms my interpretation.

25.25. Perfect with 3 pl. subject: *uvāca* SP 196.3; Mv i.150.14; 190.10; 300.15; in i.152.8 = *avocat* i.226.2 and ii.29.5 (same vs); i.328.16 (prose); ii.96.6 (prose); iii.323.7 (prose); *āha* Mv i.8.1 (prose, in same line *āhansuḥ*); *pratyujjagāma* Divy 408.25 (subject *paurāḥ*).

Other than third singular forms

25.26. Much rarer is the use of 1 or 2 sg. or 3 pl. forms with inappropriate subjects.

25.27. First person forms. Optative forms in *-eyam*, identical with the Skt. 1 sg., are used as 3 sg. (§ 29.31). Otherwise note the curious form *bheṣye*, which looks like a 1 sg. fut. 'I shall become', but seems clearly to mean 'you will become' in LV 196.10 (vs) *kṣipraṃ bheṣye prītiprāmodyalābhī*. Tib. supports this construction. Others like this, § 31.35.

25.28. Second person forms are also rarely used in other ways than as in Skt. In SP 176.12 (vs) *kalpā atītāḥ pūrvi ye abhūḥ* (one ms. *abhūt*) can only mean 'kalpas which have passed by in former times'; the verb certainly has a 3 pl. subject.—We seem to find 2 sg. forms used with 2 pl. subjects in *uttiṣṭha* LV 17.4 and *jānīyāḥ* LV 274.18 (both prose; all mss.).—In LV 300.16 (vs) *kuru prayatnam* is taken by Foucaux as 3 sg., 'let him (the Bodhisattva) make an effort'. But it is clearly addressed to Māra and is a true 2 sg. impv.; so Tib. (contrary to Foucaux: bsgrim pa gyis, not 3 person).

25.29. A special case is the use of 2 person verbs with the nom. of the stem *bhavant*, regularly used with 3 person verbs but as a substitute for the 2 person of direct address; *mā bhavanto viṣīdatha* Mv i.108.1; *mā bhavān ikṣvākuḥ . . . anutapyāhi* Mv ii.428.3. Cf. the converse § 25.7.

25.30. Third plural forms. Note that AMg. uses 3 pl. aorists as 1 and 3 sg. (Pischel 516 end). Our language also occasionally uses 3 pl. forms, mostly preterites, for other persons and singular number. So, as 3 sg., forms in *-etsu(ḥ)*; *upasaṃkrametsu* (v.l. °*suḥ*) Mv i.328.19 (prose; Senart em. °*mesi*); *abhyakiletsuḥ* Mv i.335.10 (prose; so mss., read °*kiretsuḥ*? Senart em. *abhyokiresi*); *prāpuṇetsuḥ* Mv iii.338.20 (prose; Senart em. °*ṇesi*). — Other preterites: *avaciṣu* LV 240.21; 241.8, 19 (all vss; no v.l.; unquestionably sing. subjects); *praviśiṣu* Mv i.98.12 (vs; subject the Bodhisattva; Senart takes it as a desiderative adjective, which is impossible); *avacimsu(ḥ)* Suv 233.7 (vs); *abhistavinsu* or °*tsu* Suv 243.10 (vs); *abhūvan* (subject *vīryaṃ*) LV 164.7 (vs).—Perfect: *ovācu* 'he said' Gv 212.16 (vs; *o* is m.c. for *u*, and if the final *u* is not corrupt, it must represent *-uḥ*, the 3 pl. ending attached to an otherwise 3 sg. form).—Also presents: *rājā paricintayanti* Suv 237.3 (vs); *prekṣanti* Suv 233.1 (vs); all mss. read so both times, with unmistakable 3 sg. subjects.

25.31. With 2 pl. subject: *prapateyu* (v.l. °*ya*) *yūyaṃ* 'you would fall down' LV 304.6 (vs).

25.32. With 1 pl. subject: *vayaṃ . . . āsan* Divy 243.16–17; 335.23–24; 336.21–22 (all prose); (*vayaṃ*) . . . *sākṣātkuryuḥ* Divy 347.18 (prose); *vayaṃ smo* (= *smas*!) . . . *abhūvan* Av i.257.3–4 (prose); *vayaṃ ca . . . abhūvan* SP 108.17 (prose; so doubtless to be read with 3 mss., one *abhūvaṃ*, Kashgar rec. *āsīt*, text *abhūma*).

25.33. With 1 sg. subject: *aham āsann evaṃnâmā* LV 345.13 (prose, no v.l. in Lefm.; Foucaux, Notes 185, cites one of his mss. as *āsaṃ*, doubtless lect. fac.; Weller 34 regards *āsann* as a phonetic equivalent of *āsaṃ* = *āsam*, implausibly).

26. Personal endings

26.1. For the most part, personal endings will be found treated under the various mood and tense systems. Here we shall deal with a few endings which are of wider application than any one such category.

26.2. ī for final i. The endings *mi, si, ti, nti,* and impv. *hi* all appear frequently with *ī* m.c. See under Imperative for examples of *hī*. A few cases of the other endings are quoted here.

1 sg. *mī*: *anucintayāmī* (so with all Nep. mss.) SP 61.11; *(a)smī* (with Nep. mss.) SP 87.3; *saṃdiśāmī* SP 97.5; *saṃtarpayāmī* SP 128.13; *manyamī* LV 55.21; *paśyamī* LV 56.18; *jānamī* LV 56.20; *socamī* LV 111.7 (= *śocāmi*); *stavamī* Bhad 4; *pūjayamī* Bhad 7; *pratideśayamī* Bhad 8; *anumodayamī* Bhad 9; *nāmayamī* Bhad 12, 42, 55, 56.

2 sg. *sī*: *janesī* LV 57.17; 91.21 (= *janayasi*).

3 sg. *tī*: *samādapetī* SP 23.6 (so with all mss and WT!); *vinetī* SP 92.2 (so read with WT for *vineti* of KN with Kashgar rec.; Nep. mss. *vinetrī*; translate: '... all hear my Buddha- [v.l. *dharma-*] rule, [namely] this clever device of the Jina, whereby he trains many Bodhisattvas'); *bhotī* SP 94.3; *bhavatī* SP 95.11; Mv ii.378.3 and 4 (so read with mss.); *onahatī* SP 126.2 (= *avanahati*, for °*hyati*); *cariṣyatī* SP 145.10; *vinaśyatī* SP 177.5; *deśeṣyatī* SP 207.12 (Kashgar rec. °*te*); *icchatī* LV 46.1; *bheṣyatī* LV 54.5; *roditī* LV 111.3; *jānatī* Samādh 8.6.

3 pl. *ntī* (for some cases of *bhontī* at the end of lines, where length is not demanded by the meter, see § 3.12): *śṛṇontī* (so read with 2 mss. and WT with their ms. K') SP 91.6; *stuvantī* LV 56.18; *bhontī* (= *bhavanti*) Dbh.g. 17(353).12; Sukh 46.4; *karontī* Sukh 50.18.

26.3. i for e. In 2 and 3 sg. forms this change, tho it may be essentially m.c., involves substitution of active for medio-passive endings; see § 37.12. In 1 sg. (and rarely 1 pl.) forms it cannot be so interpreted, but seems to be exclusively a matter of meter; when a short syllable is required, *i* replaces *e*. It must be noted that sometimes, especially in Mv, final *e* is still written (at least in the mss.) even under these circumstances: Mv i.72.5 *mokṣayiṣyĕ haṃ* (meter also requires *ha*). Cf. § 3.64. Examples: *bheṣyi* (= *bhaviṣye*) SP 64.6; Mv i.234.6; *toṣayi* SP 45.6; *niryātayi* SP 115.9; *smari* 'I remember' LV 55.21; *anuśikṣayi* LV 138.6; *śruṇiṣyi* LV 222.13; *dadi* LV 233.11; *vasi* 'I dwell' LV 325.10; *praṇipati* LV 361.19; 363.10 (probably not aorist as I assumed JAOS 57.21, but for °*pate*, 1 sg. mid., with 1 pl. subject in 363.10); *vartayiṣyi* Mv i.72.9 (Senart's note p. 433 seems to say that the mss. read °*yiṣi*, intending °*yiṣyi*); *pūjeṣyi* Mv i.234.10; ii.300.9; *mociṣyi upapadyatām* Mv ii.354.3 (? here meter does not require short *-i*; but note v.l. *mocayiṣyopapadyatām*) 'of them, coming to birth with the thought "I shall free (creatures)"'; construe with *teṣām* in next line (contra Senart); *vandi* Mv iii.401.15; *vijāni* Gv 215.12.—First plural: *vandāmahi* LV 360.16 (present).

Secondary first singular *n* for *m* (*ṃ*)

26.4. The writing of *n* for *ṃ* (*m*), before a consonant, is probably purely orthographic. It may be illustrated by *apaśyan* 'I saw' (for *apaśyaṃ*, before *ś-*) LV 114.9.

First plural *ma* and *mas*

26.5. In Skt. *mas* is regular as the primary 1 pl. ending, *ma* as the secondary. (In the epic the rule is often violated.) In Pali *ma* is used for both, exclusively so far as appears from Geiger 121–2. In most Prakrits, on the contrary, *mo* is regular; according to Pischel 455, *ma* should be regarded as genuine only in verses, presumably m.c. (but without restriction to secondary endings).

26.6. In our language, naturally, meter often requires one or the other in the positions where they occur. But in metrically indifferent positions, and even in prose, we frequently find *ma* where Skt. would use *mas*, and vice versa. No principle governing their distribution has been discovered; but *ma* for Skt. *mas* is much commoner than *mas* for Skt. *ma* (tho this may be in part due to careless writing; it is easier to omit than to add visarga). In the following I shall cite examples either from prose or from metrically indifferent positions in verse.

ma for Skt. *mas*: *sma* SP 100.9, 10; 101.8; 206.5, 6; 210.4; 222.12, 13; Mv i.8.2 (twice); Gv 326.6 ff. (7 times); *pradarśayāma* SP 116.6; *vicintayāma* SP 116.11; *dadāma* SP 177.13; *bheṣyāma* SP 223.1; *vadhiṣyāma* (read with mss. *vahi*°, followed by *nti*, read *tti* = *iti*; Senart em. *vadhiṣyāmi*) Mv i.17.2; *gacchāma* Mv i.183.20; *ājānāma* Mv i.246.11; *dema niryātema* Mv i.299.20; *rocayāma* Mv ii.79.10; *śṛṇoma gacchāma jānāma* Mv ii.172.11; *bhaviṣyāma* Divy 252.28 (mss., ed. em. °*maḥ*).

mas for Skt. *ma*: *paśyāmo* 'let us see' (subj.-impv.) SP 242.1 (prose; so mss.; ed. em. °*ma*); *syāmo* (opt.) SP 70.7; *saṃmanyemaḥ* Mv i.347.18; *mucyemaḥ* Divy 231.23; *bhavemaḥ* Divy 252.20 (mss., ed. °*ma*); *labhemo* Divy 340.13; *caremo* 340.15.

First plural *mha*?

26.7. Senart reads *paricaremha* 'we would revere' in Mv iii.282.5, 11; 283.1, 2, 7. The mss. vary greatly; the Pali parallel, SN i.124.26, has *paricārema*. There are readings *paricarema*, °*care 'haṃ*, and perhaps °*caramhe*. Cf. the Pali ending *mhe*, Geiger 122, and the Pkt. ending *mha*, Pischel 455. But the mss. are too confused to allow any reliable inference as to what our author really wrote. Cf. however *akārimha*, § 32.40, which is better attested.

First plural *matha* (*mathā*)

26.8. A few times in Mv and SP we seem to find 1 pl. forms in which the syllable *tha* (or m.c. *thā*) is added to the ending *ma*. Some are clearly present indicatives; some, indistinguishable in form from the latter, seem to have imperative force and may really be historically subj.-impv. (since *mas* and *ma* interchange freely, the distinction between these and the indic. no longer exists in the regular forms); some are optatives, not necessarily injunctive in force but also potential; and some futures.

26.9 I find it hard to explain these forms. Sometimes it is possible to assume that *-tha* is only the particle *atha* (all forms but one occur in verses, and *atha* would automatically appear as *tha* after *-ma* if this syllable must be short); but this seems impossible, or extremely forced,

in most of the cases here listed. If all the forms had the force of imperatives, one might suppose that the 2 pl. impv. ending had been added to the 1 pl. (indic.) as in Russian *idjomtji, paydjomtji* 'let's go!' (felt as an injunction to the person or persons addressed). But this could hardly explain an optative used in the potential or conditional sense, still less indicatives which are plain statements of fact[1].

26.10. I find no trace of such an ending in MIndic. The Pkt. ending *-mha* (§ 26.7) can hardly be related. Without explanation, the form is recognized by Senart, Mv, notes on i.29.11; 69.8; and ii.204.15; and by KN on SP 118.13, 177.15, referring to other Mv forms. All our forms are from vss except one, marked prose:

Future: *saṃśrāvayiṣyāmatha* (possibly particle *atha*; Kashgar rec. °*ma im-*) SP 118.13; *upasaṃhariṣyāmatha* Mv ii.204.15; (?) *drakṣyāmatha* (em.) iii.112.7.

Imperative, or Present indicative with hortative or injunctive force: *sādhu* (read °*ū* with K′ and WT) *gaveṣāmatha etam arthaṃ*, 'please let us (all) investigate this matter' SP 164.13; also Kashgar rec. *gaveṣāmatha* 171.12; *śṛṇomathā saṃmukha lokanātha* 314.2 (WT with ms. K′ *saṃmukhi lokanāthā*, as abl.), 'let us hear from the Lord of the World in his presence' (with WT), but the particle *atha* is here possible; *vijahāmatha* Mv i.69.8; *labhāmatha* (obscure) iii.5.9; *ramāmatha* 6.2, clearly 'let us enjoy ourselves'.

Present indicative, in statements of fact (no impv. force): *labhāmatha* Mv iii.9.17 and *āsāmatha* 19, 'we get, we sit', precisely equivalent to *labhāmahe, āsāmahe* (v.l. in both °*matha*) in lines 7, 9 above; *jīvāmatha* 11.15; *vayaṃ ca etāye gāthāye arthaṃ na vijānāmatha* (v.l. °*mitha*! aorist?) 192.7, 'and we do not understand (have not understood?) the meaning of this verse'; next sentence begins *tato* 'so, therefore', and particle *atha* seems impossible; *vayaṃ te pūrayāmatha* 215.13, 'we (will) give you your fill', and 14 *dhārayāmatha*.

Optative: *nadematha* Mv i.29.11 (so mss., Senart em. *nadāmatha*; but meaning very obscure); *bhavematha* iii.11.17, potential, 'we would be'; *anupaśyematha*, 23.2 'let us investigate', injunctive optative; possibly particle *atha*, but not likely; *spṛśematha* Kashgar rec. v.l. SP 177.15.

Second plural *ta* varying with *tha*

26.11. As in Pali and MIndic generally, the Skt. primary 2 pl. ending *tha* very commonly replaces the secondary ending *ta*, particularly in impv. and opt. forms. The reverse, that is, use of *ta* where Skt. would have *tha*, is extremely rare, but seems to occur at least once, in LV 209.8 (prose) *kim evaṃ kathayata*, 'why do you speak thus?' So Lefm. with his best ms. (one of Foucaux's mss., Notes 148, also reads thus); the other mss. and Calc. *kathayate*, which could at best be a middle form with passive meaning, 'why is it spoken thus?'

26.12. In the impv., 2 pl. *tha* (or *thā*, almost invariably m.c.) is extremely common. In most texts (not in Mv) this is commoner in verses than in prose. Yet most other texts also use it in prose, and most of our examples will be chosen from prose. Instructive as to changes in text tradition (cf. § 1.43) are Ud xv.7 (vs), where *pratibuddhatha* of the oldest ms. is altered in later mss. to *pratibudhyata(ḥ)*, and xviii.3 (vs), where old *chindatha, bhavatha* are similarly changed to °*ta*.—The final *a* is, of course, capable of being lengthened, only in verses, and usually m.c.; but note Dbh.g. 19(355).17 *pūjayathā*, at the end of a line, not m.c.; and there is a v.l. *janethā* for °*tha* in Bhad 54, also at the end of a line, metrically indifferent; cf. § 26.16, perhaps to be identified with these cases.—Thematic *a* before *tha* may also be lengthened (§ 27.2).

26.13. Second plural imperative tha in prose. In SP 43.13, read with most Nep. mss. *prajānītha*; *āgacchatha* 74.8 (read with most mss.); *pibatha* 321.5. Frequently (e. g. 188.2) the Kashgar rec. has forms in *tha* not adopted in ed.—*utpādayatha* LV 90.22 (best mss.; v.l. °*ta*); *nivartayatha* 228.8. — *chindatha*, Mv i.18.2, *utpāṭetha* 3, 4; *aśnutha khādatha pibatha detha* ... *karotha* ... *caratha* 196.14; *utpadyatha* 198.13; *karotha* 245.7; *udīretha* 245.14, etc.. — *gacchatha* Divy 292.21, *gaṇayatha* 22; *gacchatha* 293.6; 296.18 (in these four ed. em. °*ta*, but in the rest ed. keeps the reading of the mss.); *āgacchatha* 340.18; *niṣīdatha* 350.13; *ānayatha* 372.25, *praveśayatha* 26; *utpāṭayatha* 411.8, 12; *citrayatha* 547.8. — *varjayatha* Śikṣ 61.14 (so ms., ed. em. °*ta*, which is read in ms. in the following parallel verb forms). — *pratisaratha* KP 64.3; *parimargatha* (read °*mārg*°?) 105.1. — *bhuñjatha pibatha mātikramatha*, Sādh 532.11, *bhavatha* 12. — *pratīyatha* Sukh 97.5, 11, etc.; *mākāṅkṣayatha* 99.6. — *krīḍatha ramatha paricārayatha* Mmk 663.11. — *mā vilambathāgacchatha* Megh 306.16. — *gacchata bhavanto vicārayatheti* MSV ii.65.16.

26.14. Second plural imperative thā in vss m.c. *śṛṇuthā* SP 87.7; *nirdhāvathā* 87.9; *parigṛhṇathā* 90.10; *jahathā* 326.3. — *rakṣathā* LV 79.10, *pravethā* 12 (= *pravayata*); *apanethā* 123.5; *nirbandhathā* 193.13. — *abhiyujyathā* RP 33.2.

26.15. Second plural optative in tha. Also numerous; examples from prose: *rocetha* LV 15.11; *kuryātha* Mv ii.233.18; *pṛccheyātha* Mv ii.102.18; from verses (some with final *ā*, mostly m.c.) *dadyatha* Mv ii.105.3 (§ 29.43); *bhavetha* SP 198.8; *bhavethā* LV 80.3, *darśayethā 'dya* 4; *śocayethā* 231.18; *upanāmayethā* 383.13; *gacchethā* 389.15; *sevetha* RP 32.18, etc.

Second plural *thāḥ* (?), *thā*

26.16. In LV (only) we seem to find a number of 2 pl. forms, all impv. or opt. in injunctive sense, ending in *thāḥ*, or sometimes *thā*. The latter might be regarded as m.c. for *tha*, except that it may occur in metrically indifferent positions. Nevertheless, since the forms in *thāḥ* are not numerous, possibly they may be taken as mere corruptions, and the forms in *thā* as equivalent to *tha*, even when not strictly required by the meter; we have indeed conceded this possibility in § 26.12.

LV 36.14 ff. contains an address by the Bodhisattva to the Tuṣita gods, with many 2 pl. forms, mostly regular (as *gacchata* 36.19). But among them are *pratipadyathāḥ* 36.21; *carethāḥ* 37.9; *anusmarethā* (one good ms. °*thāḥ*; followed by *dh-*) 37.10; *nirīkṣathā* (but some mss. °*tha*; followed by *y-*) 37.12; *ārabhethā yathā ca vadathā tatha karothā* (here line ends) 37.19; *samanusmarathā* (followed by *p-*) 37.22; *vidhamathā* (followed by *s-*) 38.6; *avatiṣṭhathā* (followed by *n-*) 38.9.

In LV 138.12 and 14, at the end of lines, Lefmann *varethā* 'choose!'; in 12 all mss. but one (A, the best) with Calc. °*thāḥ*; in 14 all mss. °*thā*, only Calc. °*thāḥ*. Foucaux and Calc. understand a 2 sg. middle (ending *thāḥ*), presumably opt., *varethāḥ* for Skt. *varayethāḥ*, addressed to the king alone (as in line 18, *varayasva*). This is indeed possible. But it may also be 2 pl., addressed to the Śākya counsellors as a group.

---

1. Hiän-lin Dschi briefly lists the forms in a note in Indian Linguistics 11 (1949).1–4 and attributes them to the 'eastern dialect' which in his opinion is found in Mv (see my §§ 1.24 ff.), but attempts no explanation. He quotes W. Krause as considering it an IE. ending (= Gk. -μεθα), which seems to me fantastic and highly unlikely.

Second plural middle *dhvam* for *dhve*, and vice versa

26.17. In Divy 511.22, 26 (prose) *dhvam* is used in the 2 pl. present, for *dhve*: *kiṃ lajjādhvam*, 'are you ashamed?' Anomalous also is the long thematic vowel (§ 27.3).

The opposite of this, primary *dhve* for *dhvam*, occurs in the imperative, § 30.19.

Third plural *u* for *us*

26.18. For Skt. *us* in the 3 pl. endings, principally optative and aorist, *u* occurs very commonly, and by no means only when in verses the meter requires a short final. In the aorist, *iṣu* may fairly be called the regular 3 pl. ending; *iṃsu* vies with it; when meter demands a long final, the texts generally write *ū*, much less often *uḥ* or another saṃdhi representative of Skt. *us*. But forms ending in *u*, without *s*, are also found in prose. This is equally true of aorist forms in *āsu*, *ānsu*, etc., *eṣu*, *ensu*, *etsu*, etc., and in such isolated forms as *abhūnsu*, *abhūtsu*, etc.; all occur in prose, at least in that of Mv, and are usually matched by corresponding forms in final *uḥ*, apparently without any distinguishing principle (possibly only by secondary adaptation to Skt.; but they are very common in the mss.). These forms, and a few other stray cases like *adṛsu* = *adṛśuḥ*, § 32.118, are all dealt with in the chapter on the Aorist, §§ 32.29–38, 75, 95 ff. (esp. 100).

26.19. In the 3 pl. optative, also, (*y*)*us* appears as (*y*)*u*, chiefly to be sure in verses, but not always where meter demands a short final. Thus for *ramayeyu rahogatāḥ* of the mss. in Suv 16.11 Nobel actually reads *ramayeyū* by em.; the meter is however indifferent and °*yu* may stand. Other examples are *gṛhṇīyu* SP 47.14; *bhaveyu* SP 59.1; 82.13; 116.4; 171.1; 326.12; Bhad 58; *dahyeyu naśyeyu* SP 86.8; *bhrameyu* 125.12; *vrajeyu* 171.1, *hāyeyu* 2; *nipateyu* LV 153.9, 10; *prapateyu* 216.20; *śṛṇuyu* Mv i.72.1; *vrajeyu* Sukh 53.4.

27. Non-Sanskritic treatment of thematic vowel

ā for *a* as thematic vowel

27.1. The lengthening of the thematic vowel *a* is common, but almost limited to verses and to positions where meter demands it. Examples are: *bhavāti* (with Kashgar rec.) SP 96.6; *sahāti* LV 81.20; *labhāti* 137.22; *mocayātī* 184.3, 4; *āśvāsayātī* 231.10; *bhaṇātī* 233.5; *carāti* 240.22; *rudāsi* 253.8; *yajāti* 271.6; *āmantrayāti* 302.22;. (*bhavāsi* Mv i.207.17, so Senart, but mss. *bhavasi*; prob. read *bhavāhi*, impv., with repetition ii.12.7;)*pratibhaṇāti* Mv i.246.16; *hanāti* ii.81.6; *viharāti* Gv 208.15; *bhaṇāti* 212.21; *anusmarāti* 214.21; *cintayāti* Dbh.g. 12(348).21; *prodyayāmāna* = *prodyāyamāna* Dbh.g. 51(77).25.

27.2. A special case, by no means limited to metrical lengthening, is the 2 sg. impv. ending *āhi*; see §§ 30.2,6. Parallel to this there are also cases of 2 pl. impv. in *ātha*, all in verses and probably m.c. However, the existence of *āhi* as a standard 2 sg. impv. ending (independent of meter), which might have exerted an influence on the 2 pl., makes this a bit less certain than the preceding cases. Examples: *parivārayātha* LV 43.21; *nirīkṣayātha* LV 50.10; *bhaṇātha* Mv i.207.14 = ii.12.4, 18; *paśyātha* Sukh 51.5, 7.

27.3. Isolated, so far as I know, is the 2 pl. mid. *lajjādhvam* = *lajjadhve* Divy 511.22 and 26 (prose): *kiṃ la*° 'are you ashamed?' Perhaps the *ā* here is due to influence of the noun *lajjā*.

27.4. āsi, āti, 2 and 3 sg., apparently or supposedly with modal force (called 'subjunctives'). Senart, Mv i.499 and elsewhere, recognizes certain forms in *āsi*, *āti* as subjunctives, following Pischel's earlier interpretation of certain forms in these same endings in Pali. Geiger 123 admits a few such forms, 'where subjunctive (imperative) meaning is clearly present and the possibility of lengthening (of thematic *a*) *metri causa* seems excluded.' But, contrary to Geiger's statement, none of the cases accepted by him can qualify by his own criterion, since they all may have *ā* m.c. This is equally true of practically all the Mv cases. The only certain exceptions are Mv iii.268.8 (prose) *bhaṇāti*, apparently = 'he shall say, he is to say, let him say'; and ii.256.4 (prose) *yadi ātmamāṃsaṃ parityajāsi*, 'if you give up your own flesh'. Particularly in this latter passage, it is doubtful whether the form is other than a present indicative. As to *bhaṇāti*, it must be noted that *bhaṇādi* and similar forms from this root occur in certain Prakrits as indicatives. Pischel 514 interprets them as analogical to 9th class forms.

27.5. There is even, once at least, a form ending in *asi*, normal 2 sg. pres. indic., which is just as modal ('subjunctive' or 'imperative') as any of Senart's forms in *āsi*, *āti*: *mālām eva ca gūhasi* Mv iii.4.1 (vs), which can only mean 'and wind a garland instead!' (Senart's note calls it 'indicative for subjunctive'.) To be sure the meter requires a short penult, and the ending could be described as shortening of (supposed 'subjunctive') *āsi*, m.c. But the fact is that indicative forms are often used with modal values in our dialect, as indeed in Skt. and Vedic (Vedic Variants I p. 65 ff.).

27.6. I am not much impressed by the proposal to connect this *ā*(*-si*, *-ti*) with the old Vedic subjunctive. For the most part I believe it is mere metrical lengthening. The few prose cases might be modifications of indicative forms in *asi*, *ati* (often used in ways hardly distinguishable from optatives, whether injunctive or potential-conditional) on the pattern of such endings as AMg. *ejjasi*: *ejjāsi*, both familiarly used as optatives (Pischel 461).

27.7. I shall, however, now list all the forms known to me in *āsi* and *āti*, where injunctive (or, in a few specified cases, potential-conditional) meaning either seems probably present, or has been assumed by Senart. All the textually reliable cases are verses (and most could have *ā* m.c.) except those mentioned above.

27.8. *paśyāsi* (mss. *paśyāmi*, but Senart's em. seems certain) Mv i.155.21; *gacchāsi* 157.3; *pratipadyāsi* 279.19 (vs, but *ā* not required by meter; however, mss. read °*yosi*; and °*yesi*, cf. §§ 29.20–21, would be at least as likely an emendation); *saced bhadante gacchāsi* ii.194.11, conditional; in 248.7 (prose), Senart *mā paritapyāsi*, but v.l. °*yāmi*, 1st person, which is probably the true reading: '(don't harbor longing further) lest I suffer for it (as your husband)'; the crocodile speaks to his dohala-stricken wife; *parityajāsi* 256.4, cited § 27.4; *sobhāsi* (= *śobhasi*) 321.17; *bhaṇāti* 384.7 (?potential, if not indicative); iii.268.8, cited above.

a for *ā* as thematic vowel

27.9. Shortening of a thematic vowel which is long in Skt. is also common, but occurs exclusively in verses m.c.: *adhyeṣami* SP 38.2; Bhad 10; *adhyeṣama* (for °*āmaḥ*) LV 50.14; *prajānami* SP 220.13; *jānamī* LV 56.20; *jānami* Gv 212.22; *manyamī* LV 55.21; *paśyamī* LV 56.18; *paśyami* Suv 51.7; Gv 230.21; *gacchamo* LV 78.15; °*ma* LV 133.7; 134.6; *socamī* LV 111.7; *vrajama* LV 113.18; *kathayamī* LV 138.14; *prekṣami* LV 236.3; *muñcamī* LV 236.4; *dadamī* LV 236.6; °*mi* id. 241.14; *budhyamī* LV 287.20; *vandamo* RP 5.7, 8, 18; 6.14 etc.; *vandami* RP 5.16; Bhad 1, 7; *adhimucyami* Bhad 3; *stavamī* Bhad 4; *pūjayamī* Bhad 7; *pratideśayamī* Bhad 8; *anumodayamī* Bhad 9; *abhiyācami* Bhad 11; *nāmayamī* Bhad 12, 42, 55, 56; *prabhāsami* Gv 230.14; *chindami* Gv 231.20; *yujyami* Dbh.g. 7(343).25; *bhavamo* Dbh.g. 23(359).1; *bhaviṣyami* Sukh 8.9.

i instead of thematic vowel *a*, *ā*

27.10. In certain Pkt. dialects (AMg., M.; Pischel 108, 455; Bloch, Indo-aryen, 235 f.) 1 pl. forms may end in *imo*, *ima* instead of *āmo*, *āma*. A few such forms, including *vandima* (AMg. M. *vandimo*), are found in our language. But also, if the tradition is to be trusted, a few other forms show *i* instead of regular thematic *a*: one 3 dual present ind., and several imperative forms (3 sg. and 2 pl. active, 2 and 3 sg. middle). I am not impressed by Pischel's explanation of the *imo* forms by association with shift of accent (Pischel himself admits countercases). Of different character are futures like *hohiti*, *kāhiti* (§ 31.12) where the *i* is doubtless connected with the *y*(*a*) of the original future sign; and aorists in *i*(*t*)*tha* etc. (§ 32.41), where the *i* is derived from the old *is*-aorist. But it is,

perhaps, not impossible that our forms, or some of them, may have been made in analogical imitation of some such futures or aorists, or of old presents in *i-ti* of the type *svapiti, roditi*. The forms recorded are:

1 pl. *ima, imo*: *vandima* (AMg. M. *vandimo*) LV 364.6, 19; 365.5; *ramimo* LV 321.20; *prekṣima* LV 367.13 (Lefm. em. *prekṣiya*); *pūjima* Dbh.g. 19(355).9 (but here *i* possibly m.c. for *e* = *ayā*, to *pūjayati*).

3 dual *itaḥ*: *krīḍitaḥ* Divy 404.18, 21, 23 (twice).

3 sg. impv. *itu*: *prāvaritu* 'let him put on' Divy 215.29 (to *prāvarati*).

2 pl. impv. *itha*: *saṃnipatitha* Mv i.329.17 'assemble!', parallel to *niṣīdatha* in the same context.

2 sg. impv. mid. *iṣu*: *mā kāṅkṣiṣu* 'don't hesitate!' Mv ii.55.21 (see § 30.16).

3 sg. impv. mid. *itām*: *anubaddhitāṃ* LV 45.4, for *anubandhatāṃ*, 'let him attach himself to, follow' (on the present stem *baddha-ti* see Chap. 43, s.v. *bandh*).

28. Summary classification of non-Sanskrit presents

28.1. In principle, and descriptively, all thematic verbs form a single morphological category, inflected identically thruout. From the descriptive standpoint, therefore, there is no reason to classify them at all, unless by pointing out that some of them have alternative stems. Thus stems in *-ya-* vary with those in simple *-a-*. There are pairs like *karati:kurvati*, *śruṇati*: *śṛṇvati*, etc. Sometimes there is a richer variety: *tiṣṭhati*, *sthihati*, and at least in compounds *-sthahati*, besides long-vowel presents *sthāti* and (in cpds.) *-stheti*, and still other rarer types, are all quite interchangeable presents of the Sanskrit root *sthā*.

28.2. In the following rough and ready grouping of verb formations, I have tried to take note of descriptive groupings so far as they suggest themselves. But at the same time, and particularly in subdivisions of the thematic verbs, I have called attention to what I believe to be the historic origin of all new (non-Skt.) verb stems, so far as seemed possible.

Third singular *ati* based on Sanskrit third plural *anti*

28.3. In many cases the MIndic present in *ati* is based on a Skt. 3 pl. in *anti*, non-thematic. Some of these occur sporadically in Skt., particularly epic; and it is probable that the same process produced regular Skt. presents like *muñcati*, *siñcati* (which do not fit the original IE phonemic pattern: Edgerton, Lang. 19.109 ff.), tho there is no record of **munakti*, **sinakti*. In MIndic the process has completely eliminated the non-thematic 7th class of Skt. (Geiger 144; Pischel 506).

28.4. BHS forms from 7th class presents are *añjati* (only ppp. *añjita-*), *chindati*, *bhañjati*, *bhindati*, *bhuñjati* (in Skt., Wh. Roots, U +), *yuñjati* (E +), *riñcati*, *rundhati* (E +); and *piṣati* (sporadic in Skt.; AMg. *pīsai*) which is a phonetic equivalent, by the Morengesetz, § 3.3, of Pali *piṃsati* (sporadically Skt. *piṃṣa-*) based on 3 pl. *piṃṣanti* to *pinaṣṭi*; see Chap. 43 s.v.

28.5. Ninth class presents also develop forms like *krīṇa-ti* to 3 pl. *krīṇanti*; but here the Skt. 1 sg. *krīṇāmi* (cf. § 28.8) will also have been influential. Similar forms are found in Pali and Pkt., which however also retain forms of 9th class type (in contrast to the lack of 7th class forms). BHS has *krīṇati*, *gṛhṇati* (Wh. Roots, E.), *jinati* (in this dialect a synonym of *jayati*), *jānati* (U. E.), and *punati* (in caus. gdve. *opunāpayitavya-*). Instead of *krīṇati* BHS has also *kriṇati*, like Pali *kiṇati*, with *i* for *ī*; Geiger 21c suggests analogical influence of *mināti*, *minati*. The form may, however, be historic. Oldenberg, RV Noten, would read *kriṇāti* for *krī°* RV 4.24.10 (the only finite form in RV), on the analogy of metrical evidence on other 9th class roots recorded with long final vowels (the isolated *krī°* is metrically indecisive), cf. Old. Proleg. 477 f.

28.6. Similarly, on the basis of 8th class 3 pl. *kurvanti*, we find very commonly *kurvati* (common also in Pali and Pkt., *kubbati*, *kuvvai*), and to 5th class *śṛṇvanti*, 3 sg. *śṛṇvati*.

28.7. Finally, to 2d class 3 pl. *vidanti* is formed thematic *vidati* (also sporadically in Skt.); and to 3 pl. *stuvanti*, **stuvati* (AMg. *thuvai*, Ratnach.), indicated by ger. *stuviya*, which prob. read for *supiya* LV 50.4, see Dict.; also probably *abhistuva* (§ 32.115). And there is a 3 sg. opt. *yeya* (or with mss. *yeyaṃ*), once, which seems to imply **yati* 'goes', to 3 pl. *yanti*.

Third singular *ati* to first singular *āmi*, and to third plural *ati*

28.8. In 9th class verbs, as we noted above, the 1 sg. of type *krīṇāmi* no doubt helped the 3 pl. *krīṇanti* to create a 3 sg. *krīṇati* and other thematic forms.

28.9. The 1st sg. *āmi* alone, without help from the 3 pl., was responsible for regular Skt. *tiṣṭhati*, if (as I think probable; there is another theory) it represents a prehistoric **tiṣṭhāti*. Skt. *jighrati* is also the regular present to *ghrā*, tho in the Veda sporadic 3d class forms occur. And other verbs of this type show in BHS (and MIndic) similar forms which may be considered fundamentally MIndic, tho they all occur at least sporadically in epic Skt., some even in Vedic. BHS has *dadati*, *dadhati*, and *jahati*.

28.10. Once we find *śraddhate*, 3 sg., apparently to the MIndic *śraddhāmi* by this same analogical process (*śrad-dhāti* occurs, cf. § 28.51). Perhaps **ava-dhyati* (pres. pple. *avadhyanto*) is similarly based on *-dhyāmi*; and **samākhyati* (aor. *samākhyetsu*) on *-khyāmi*.

28.11. Since such forms as *dadati* are identical with the old non-thematic 3 plurals (to 3 sg. *dadāti* etc.), we find in BHS such old 3 plurals in *ati* used likewise as 3 sg. even when there is no 1 sg. in *āmi*: *jāgrati* (Skt. 3 pl., as 3 sg. 'S.E.' in Skt., Whitney, Roots, and in BHS), to regular Skt. *jāgarmi*, *jāgarti*; and *juhvati* (Skt. 3 pl., BHS 3 sg.) to *juhomi*, *juhoti*. (For 3 sg. BHS *juhati* see § 28.18.) We may assume a proportion: *dadati* (3 pl.): *dadati* (3 sg.) = *jāgrati*, *juhvati* (3 pl.): x (*jāgrati*, *juhvati*, 3 sg.).

Present *ati* based on Skt. preterites in *at*

28.12. On the basis of Skt. preterites, mostly historic aorists, in *-at*, BHS and MIndic form presents in *ati*. So *gamati* to *agamat* (cf. also fut. *gamiṣyati*); *druhati* (AMg. *duhati*, *duhai*) to Vedic and Epic *adruhat*; *darśati* and *dṛśati* to *adarśat*, *adṛśat* (both pre-classical in Skt. but paralleled in MIndic); *lipati* to *alipat*; *sicati* to *asicat*; *chinati* (aor. *chini*, ger. *chinitvā*) to impf. *acchinat* (*acchinas* Pāṇ., *acchinam* Mbh.), Chap. 43, s.v. *chid* (2). And *vacati* to **avacat* (Pali *avaca*) is doubtless a modification of Skt. *avocat*, blended with related forms in *vac*.

Present *ati* based on future *iṣyati*

28.13. In a number of other cases it seems probable that *ati*-presents have been formed to Skt. futures in *iṣyati*, on such models as *bhaviṣyati* to *bhavati* and many similar cases. This seems to be the source, particularly, of several such presents from roots in *ṛ* (*ar*), notably the common *karati* (to *kariṣyati*) instead of *karoti*; also *jāgarati* (once in Mbh.), *dharati*, *marati*, *starati* (this is sporadic in Skt.). Note that Skt. has *carati*, *tarati*, *sarati*, *smarati*, *harati*, by the side of *cariṣyati*, *tariṣyati*, etc. But *varati* (for *vṛṇoti*) can hardly be based on *variṣyati* (only Gr. in Skt.). Perhaps it is based on the ppp. *vṛta-*, on the model

of *harati, sarati, smarati* (BHS *karati*, etc.) to *hṛta-, sṛta-, smṛta-* (*kṛta-*, etc.). And *-varati*, to the same root (Pali *-purati*), seems to be a phonetic modification of this *varati*, with *u* for *a* by assimilation to the labial consonant; see Chap. 43, s.v. 1 *vṛ* (3). Is the intensive *caṅkramati* based on the Vedic *caṅkramiṣyati* (§ 39.1)? Cf. § 28.30.

28.14. Other *ati* presents probably based on futures are *hanati* (Epic and late Skt.), to *haniṣyati*; *bandhati* to *bandhiṣyati*; *vadhati* (no pres. in Skt.) to *vadhiṣyati*. Perhaps also *aśate* 'eats' (Pali *asamāna-*) may be based on *aśiṣyati*. Since *staviṣyati* is only Vedic, it is not likely to be the source of BHS *stavati*, Pali *thavati*.

Third singular *ati* from original (Skt.) fifth and eighth class presents

28.15. In Pali often, in Pkt. regularly, these become 9th class, or more usually (like the original 9th class) thematic presents (Geiger 147–8, Pischel 502). No explanation of the change from 5th to 9th class has ever been offered, and I am unable to offer any. There are a few roots (like *stṛ*) which show both 5th and 9th class types in Skt., but most of them show neither in MIndic. Cf. however BHS and MIndic *dhunati* to Skt. *dhunoti*, which shows a few sporadic 9th class forms in Skt.

28.16. In BHS, distinctively 9th class forms from original 5th or 8th class presents hardly exist. I have noted only *vivṛṇīṣva*, once (Whitney, Roots, records *avṛṇīdhvam*, AV); and ger. *abhinirmiṇīya*, seemingly based on the weak 9th class stem *-minīte*.

28.17. On the other hand, thematic presents from such roots are not uncommon. In view of the Pali evidence, it may perhaps be assumed that these presuppose the intervention of 9th class forms: e. g. *śṛṇoti* > **śruṇāti* > *śruṇati*. We find *-āpunati, -cinati, -tanati, dhunati* (*nirdhunet* cited once from Mbh.), *-minati, śruṇati*. And (*sam-, abhisaṃ-*)*bhuṇati* (once °*bhuṇoti*; in Pali often 9th class, but not 5th; also °*bhavati*) 'attains' is clearly analogical to its near-synonym Pali *pāpuṇati* (see Chap. 43, s.v. *bhū* 5). Probably we should also count *manati* here, deriving it from *manute*, which is well attested even in Classical Skt. (Pali *munāti*; AMg. *maṇai* and *muṇai*).

28.18. The substitution of *karati* for *karoti* is different; there is no reason to suppose that a **karāti*, 9th class, ever existed. The form is explained above (§ 28.13). But probably on *karati* = *karoti* is based BHS and Pali *juhati* = *juhoti*; forms based on it are commoner than those from *juhvati*, on which see § 28.11. BHS and Pali *dhunati* is probably based on *dhunoti* (*dhunāti*-forms are rare in Skt.). Conversely, we find once *-haroti* for *harati*, apparently (if genuine) analogical to *karoti* = *karati*. On *kurvati, śṛṇvati*, see § 28.6.

Presents based on past passive participles

28.19. In Language 13.116 I pointed out that a present *buddhati* is formed to root *budh*, 'doubtless a sort of denominative to the stem *buddha-*'. This has now been confirmed by the discovery of a number of similar forms: *ṛddhati, baddhati, -ruddhati*, and perhaps **viddhati*. And above all we find *lagnati*, from the *na*-participle *lagna*, abundantly attested; possibly also *laggati*, with MIndic assimilation of consonants. This gives particularly conclusive evidence that *buddhati* etc. are really based on past participles. The stem *laggati* also occurs in Pali, and *laggai* in Pkt.; Pischel 488 and Geiger 136.2 assume a *ya*-present, **lagyati*; but our *lagnati* proves them wrong. With *-aya-* suffix, *ārūḍhayati*; perhaps *prajñaptāpitaṃ*, § 38.56.

New presents in *ya*

28.20. ya after long vowels. According to Hemacandra 4.240 (cf. Pischel 487), any Prakrit present-stem ending in a vowel other than short *a*[1] may optionally take an added *ya*. This means, in practice, that stems in *ā*, and occasionally in other long vowels, may be thus extended. Nearly all the new (MIndic) *ya*-stems recorded in Geiger 136–8 and Pischel 487–8 belong in that category. Those which do not are in part phonetic developments from Skt. *ya*-stems; others (e. g. Pali *laggati*, § 28.19) are not really *ya*-stems at all.

28.21. As we shall soon see, BHS differs from Pali and Pkt. (at least as presented by Geiger and Pischel) in showing a much larger number of new stems in *ya* after consonants. After vowels, however, the conditions seem to be much the same. We find *ya* extensions chiefly of root-class presents in *ā-(ti)*; occasionally also in other long vowels. Sanskrit has such pairs. Sometimes the Skt. *-āti* form seems to be the more original (so *vāti, snāti*, as compared with *vāyati, snāyate*), or there may be no *-āyati* parallel in standard Skt. (as *māti, yāti, khyāti*). But in other Skt. cases, we find the reverse; so *trāyate* (*trāte* sporadic in RV, *trāti* Epic), *dhyāyati* (B, *dhyāti* E +), *gāyati* (*gāti* extremely rare), *mlāyati* (*mlāti* only once in BR, from MBh). To the same pattern, descriptively, belongs *jāyate* 'is born' (there is no **jāti* unless we count AMg. *jāi*, cf. § 31.3).

28.22. BHS has a number of presents in *āyati* not found in Skt. Most of them are paralleled in Pali or Pkt. or both; for details see Chap. 43 under each root. When, as often happens, Skt. has a present in *āti*, we may suppose analogical influence of such pairs as *vāti, trāti*: *vāyati, trāyate*. (The reverse also occurs: § 28.54.) But in some such cases it may seem equally reasonable to assume influence of a ppp. in *-āta-*, or a future in *-āsyati*; e. g. *trāta-, trāsyate* (°*ti*), to present *trāyate*. More than one such influence may, of course, have contributed. The pair *jāta-*: *jāyate* seems to me particularly likely to have played a rôle in creating new presents in *-āya-* to participles in *-āta-*. The presents *antara-dhāyati* and °*hāyati* seem to be based on the old Skt. 3 sg. aor. pass. *antaradhāyi*, reinterpreted as a MIndic aorist in *-i* to a stem *antaradhāya-*.

28.23. There are even cases in which Skt. had neither *-āti* nor *-āyati* presents, but both were created analogically in MIndic and BHS. Thus *bhāyati* and *bhāti* 'fears' are both based on the quasi-antonyms *trāyate* and *trāti*, and/or the quasi-synonym *palāyati* 'flees', which in BHS has ppp. *palāta, palāna* (§ 28.54); Pali has *bhāyati*, and Pkt. *bhāi*. Other special influences may exist in individual cases.

28.24. The following presents in *-āyati*, not normal in Skt. and not obviously denominative, have been noted:[2] *ākhyāyati* (Skt. *ākhyāyate*, passive), *ghrāyati, jāyate* (= *jayati*; cf. *vāyati*), *dhāyati* (root *dhā*; chiefly *antara-dh*°), *bhāyati* ('fears', see above), *bhāyati* ('shines'), *māyati, yāyati*, **vāyati* (= *vayati*, cf. *jāyate*, above; ppp. *vāyita-* = Pali id.), *sthāyati* (based on BHS *sthāti*?). There is also *hāyate*, a passive to root *hā* (§ 37.38), and *vikrāyati* or °*te*, irregular passive to *vi-krī* (§ 37.39). On *hriyāyati* see just below.

---

1. The addition of *ya* to a stem in *a* would, in Skt., Pali, and BHS, yield *-aya-*, which in MIndic and BHS often becomes *-e-*. Such stems are of course very common. But they belong to a different pattern from those considered here.

2. A few of the forms recorded here and in the next section seem to be based on historic passives; see § 37.23. The same may well be true of some cases listed in § 28.28.

28.25. After other long vowels than *ā*, note *adhīyati* (= Skt. *adhīyate*, rarely for *adhīte*). According to one view, *pattīyati* (*patī°*, *pratī°*) is ultimately based on the same root *i*, compounded with *prati*. The forms of *hrī* are varied and confusing: *hriyāyati* (and perhaps *hrīyā°*; denominative?), *jihrīyati*, *jehrīyate* (with intensive-type reduplication), and perhaps *hrīyati* (which might be based on ppp. *hrīta-*, like *nīyate*: *nīta-*, but the form is questionable, see Chap. 43). BHS seems to have shared with Pali an irregular desiderative of *śru*, *śuśrūyati* (recorded as *śuśru°*; Pali *sussūyati* beside *sussūsati*); here *y* replaces *s*, doubtless by adaptation to the form of some *ya*-present. The original passive to *ā-dā*, *ādīyati* (also *ādiyati*), is used (like Pali *ādiyati*) with active meaning, 'takes'. And once *āhūyati*, to the Skt. passive *āhūyate*, is used as an active. See § 37.23.

28.26. ya after consonants. These are surprisingly numerous. They are doubtless heterogeneous as to origin. Such explanations as have occurred to me are suggested under the various roots in Chap. 43. Sometimes they seem to be based on Skt. passives, with active endings and meanings; so *śakyati* (also Epic. Skt., see § 37.22). Sometimes they may be due to phonetic confusions, possibly errors of tradition; so *-yuñjyate* for *-yuñjate* (*y* after palatal). (Is this the explanation of *darśyanti*, LV 222.4, vs, acc. to Tib. = *darśayanti*, possibly by way of **darśanti*? same perhaps Laṅk 312.9.) Sometimes they may be hyper-Sanskritisms, analogical (unhistorical) reconstructions from MIndic forms; so *sṛjyati*, perhaps for MIndic *sajjati*, which historically is probably based on MIndic *sajje(t)i* = Skt. *sarjayati*; *niṣedyati*, q.v. in Dict.; and *vṛṣyate*, perhaps unhistorically based on Pali *vassati*.

28.27. After all explanations that I have thought of, there is left a considerable residuum for which I have thought of none. In other words, I see at present no way of avoiding the hypothesis that in BHS the *ya*-present was more or less freely productive, even after consonants.

28.28. The list follows. I omit the asterisk before forms not actually recorded in the present system.

iṣyati, *-eṣyati* (to root *iṣ*), *-īkṣyati*, *iryati* (to root *īr*), *-kramyati* (in part prob. denom., see Dict. s.v. *niṣkramyati*), *gaveṣya(ya)ti*, *-gāhyate*, *tyajyati*, *-diśyati*, *dṛśyati* (probably based on passive, cf. § 37.23; Chap. 43 s.v. *dṛś* 4), *-nadyati*, *-bādhyati*(?), *bhāṣyati*, *-bhāsyati*(?), *bhidyati*, *-madyati*, *-yuṅjyate*(?) and *-yujyate*, *rucyati* and *ruccati*, *ruhyati*, *-laṅghyati*, *-lambyate*, *vahyati*(?), *-viśyati* (see Chap. 43, s.v. *viś* 2), *vṛṣyate*, *-vrajyati* (see Chap. 43), *śakyati* (°*te*), *-śrabhyati* (°*te*), *saryati*, *-sṛjyati*, *svapyati* (Pali *suppati*, *soppati*), *-hiṇḍyate*, *hīṣyati*.

a for *ya* presents

28.29. The converse of the preceding also occurs. A present **sīvati* = *sīvyati* is implied by ppp. *sīvita-* (AMg. *sīviya-*) and ger. *sīvitvā* (cf. AV *-sīvya*). It might be explained as a phonetic equivalent of MIndic *sivvati* (Pali *sibbati*, AMg. *sivvai*) = *sīvyati*, or as analogical to noun forms like *sīvana*, *sīvaka*. And **harṣati*, implied by aor. *harṣī*, could be a hyper-Sanskritic substitution for MIndic *haṃsati* (*hassati*?) = *hṛṣyati*. For Skt. *klāmyati*, *klāmati* occurs (so Skt. Gr.).

28.30. Perhaps back-formations from past participles in *-ita-* are **kṣubhati* (caus. °*bhayati*) = *kṣubhyati* (*kṣubhita-*), and *-śamati* = *śāmyati* (*śamita-*, to caus. *śamayati*). If the intensive ppp. *caṅkramita-* exists, *caṅkramati* (rare in Skt., very common here) = *caṅkramyate* may be based on it (cf. § 28.13). And similarly *jājvalati*, intens. to *jval* (also occasionally in Epic Skt.), may be based on ppp. *jājvalita-* (recorded in BR only from Rājatar.). I have no explanation for *-nahati* = *nahyati* (cf. Pali ger. *saṃnahitvā*). But *manati* (AMg. M. *maṇai*) probably derives from a Skt. 5th or 8th class present (§ 28.17) and has no relation to *manyate*. Not very certain is (*abhi-saṃ-*)*budhati*, implied in pple. °*budhāna* (perhaps m.c. for °*buddhāna*) and fut. °*budhiṣyati*; °*budhati* occurs as v.l. for °*budhyati* once in Mvy (see Chap. 43 s.v. *budh* 2 and 4). In RP 59.18 (*an-*)*utpadanta-* seems to be a pres. pple. stem to *ut-pad-*, regularly a *ya*-present (error or misprint? see § 18.5).

Loss of infixed nasal in thematic presents

28.31. We have treated *lipati* = *limpati* and *sicati* = *siñcati* as based on aorists *alipat*, *asicat*. This is not likely to account for *mucati* (once, in vs, Chap. 43; m.c.? but AMg. *mucai*, *muyai*) = *muñcati*, since *amucat* (and *mucati*) seem to be Vedic only and not common. So once *vidanti* 'they find'; cf. early *avidat* (but *vidati* 'knows' occurs in Vedic and Epic Skt.). Stray forms pointing to *bhajati* and *bhujati* ('enjoys') occur for BHS *bhañjati* and *bhuñjati* (Chap. 43). The ger. *-yujitvā* for *-yuñj-* is of doubtful authenticity. Probably *subhati* 'smite' belongs here; Pali has only *sumbhati*, and AMg. *vi-sumbh-*; perhaps cf. Vedic *sumbhanti* KS 10.7 (132.14); TS has *asubhnan*. On *ricitvā* (RP) see Chap. 43, s.v. *riñcati*.

Infixation of nasal in thematic presents

28.32. The converse of the preceding occurs a few times. So *daṃśati* (caus. *daṃśāpayati*), occurring once in Skt. (pw; = Pali *ḍaṃsati*, AMg. *ḍaṃsai*); *-bhuñjati* 'bends', perhaps by analogy of the homonym meaning 'enjoys'; *-vṛṃhati* 'tears', perhaps due to the homonym *vṛṃhati* (*bṛṃhati*) 'increases'; and *vindhati* (AMg. *vindhai*), *vindhayati* = *vidhyati*, root *vyadh* (obscure as to origin); possibly *saṃj-* for *saj-ati*, q.v. Dict.

Thematic presents with *ā* for *a* in root syllables

28.33. There is a little group of forms which differ from Skt. thematic presents only in lengthening radical *a* to *ā*. Perhaps analogical influence of nouns containing vṛddhi root-forms may be concerned. They are: *niṣkāsati* (Dict.); *jāyate* = *jayati* and **vāyati* = *vayati*, § 28.24; *-nāmati* = *namati*; (*vyā-*)*yāmati* = *yamati* (rare in Skt., regular in Pali; Chap. 43, s.v. *yam* 2); *sphālati* or *sphāleti* = *sphalati* (Gram.), Pali *phāleti*; (*-hārati* or °*te*, prob. denom.; Pali id. = *harati*;) *-hvāyati* (Chap. 43) = *hvayati*. On *bhāyati* = *bhayati* see § 28.23.

Long *ī*, *ū* for *i*, *u* in root syllable of thematic presents

28.34. The passive of *seṭ*-roots in *ṛ*, Skt. *-īrya-*, appears in MIndic normally with *-īra-*, so that we find forms pointing to **tīrati*, **dīrati* for Skt. passives *tīryate*, *dīryate*. But in the case of *kṛ* 'scatter', this MIndic passive *kīrati* (Skt. *kīryate*) is used (in cpds.) in an active sense, in both BHS and Pali, and has the appearance of being a modification of *kirati*, with *ī* for *i*. Other forms with active meaning are sometimes based on original passives, §§ 28.24, 25 (*ākhyāyati*, *āhūyati*, *ādīyati* and *ādi°*).

28.35. The presents *pīṣati* (sporadic in Skt.) and *pīṣayati* may contain *ī* as equivalent to nasalized *i* (Pali *piṃsati*; *piṃṣati* is rare in Skt.), § 28.4.

28.36. Different in character, and without explanation so far as I know, are *hīṣati* (cf. Deśī *hīsamaṇa-*, noun) and *hiṣati* (Skt. *heṣati*; Dict.); *dūṣyate* (*dūṣyant-* once in Skt.), formally = *duṣyate*; and *mūṣati* (Pkt. *mūsai*) = Epic Skt., BHS *muṣati*, Pali *musati* (Skt. *muṣṇāti*), blended with *mūs*, *mūṣikā*? Cf. also **tīmayati* (ger. *tīmayitvā*; Ap. ppp. *tīmia-*) 'makes wet', to a root appearing in Skt. as *tim* (ppp. *timita-*). An isolated *līpyase* (root *lip*) may be corrupt.

Other new presents of the 6th class type

28.37. In the last section were mentioned *hiṣati* and *muṣati*; the latter (also in Epic Skt.) may be a back-formation from ppp. *muṣita-*, which is standard in Skt. and old (RV). Here might be classed also *sruvate* for *sravate*, with *u* for *a* probably by assimilation to *v* (§ 3.57), if not corrupt for *sravate*; *-vurati* (Pali *purati*), to *vṛ* 'cover', in my opinion based on *varati* (§ 28.13) and also due to assimilation to the (preceding) *v*; *pari-viṣati* (Pali id.), see Chap. 43; **-ghṛṣati* (Pkt. ppp. *oghasiya-*) = *gharṣati*.

Other new presents of 1st class type

28.38. These are miscellaneous, and in most cases I have little or nothing to suggest as to their origin.

28.39. Root-final semivowels: *kṣayati* 'destroy' (once in Rām.; cf. caus. *kṣayayati*, 'E+' in Whitney, Roots; fut. *kṣayiṣyati*, rare, and *kṣita-*, rarer than *kṣīṇa-*); *-cayati* (*-ceti*), cf. *cayate* V.B. in Whitney's Roots; *layati* (Gr., and *layate* V.B., Whitney, Roots); *javati* (Vedic *javate*; Chap. 43, s.v. *ju*); *lavati* (cf. Pali *lavāpeti*); *stavati* (Pali *thavati*); *-galati* or *-garati* (rare in Skt.; AMg. *galai*); *-varati* (Pali id.; § 28.13); *spharati* (Skt. Gr.; Pali *pharati*), and *pharati*, *phalati*.

28.40. Roots containing semivowel plus consonant: *kartati* 'twists' (a rare root; ppp. once *kartita-* in Epic Skt.); *-deśate* (perhaps denom.); *-dveṣate* (probably denom.); *lehati* (Pali id.), doubtless blend of Skt. *leḍhi* and *lihati*; *sparśati* (Pali *phassati*, cf. AMg. *saṃ-phāse*), see Chap. 43, perhaps back-formation from caus. *sparśayati*?; *harṣati* (*hṛṣ-*).

28.41. Presents based on original *s*-futures (or aorists) used in Pali as presents: **-drakṣati*, **-śakṣati* = Pali *dakkhati*, *sakkhati* (both presents). Our forms are of course hyper-Skt. back-formations.

28.42. *sthahati* = Pali *ṭhahati*, doubtless analogical to Pali *dahati* = *dadhāti* (with Geiger 132.4).

28.43. Unknown anywhere else is *sthihati*, which is very much commoner than *sthahati*; indeed it is so common as to suggest that it may represent the regular present of the root *sthā* in the original dialect. It seems to be a blend-form based on *sthahati*, with the vowel of the first syllable influenced by *sthita-*, *sthitvā*, or perhaps *tiṣṭhati*.

28.44. Parallel to *sthihati* in formation, and probably based on it, is (*saṃ-*)**dhihati*, implied by the aor. *saṃdhihe* (once), to root *dhā*.

28.45. *ācikṣati* 'tells' and *abhyācikṣati* 'accuses' seem to be hyper-Skt. back-formations from Pali (*abbh-*)*ācikkhati*, AMg. (*abbh-*)*āikkhai*, with form influenced by *ācakṣati*, which is a synonym of *ācikṣati*, q.v. in Dict.

Presents in *eti*

28.46. The MIndic phonetic change of *aya* to *e* results in many such presents which in Skt. ended in *-ayati*, such as *jeti*, *neti*, etc., besides the numerous causatives and denominatives. Our language also has many such forms; and they serve as base for forms outside the present system (§ 24.10). We may note also the isolated *praṇidhyenti*, apparently for *praṇi-dhyāyanti* (root *dhyā*), but possibly a corruption for *praṇidhenti* (root *dhā*, below).

28.47. Here may be listed a small group of presents in *-eti* which cannot be derived from *-ayati*. It is interesting to note that several of them have, in our language, parallel forms in *-ayati*. But there can be no doubt that these are either corruptions or secondary hyper-Sanskritisms, based on the *-eti* forms.

28.48. The most important are *-(s)theti*, *-dheti*, *deti* (also *-sthayati*, *-dhayati*, *-dayati*, hyper-Sanskritic), from the roots *sthā*, *dhā*, and *dā*, which parallel each other in many of their forms. The forms of *sthā* seem certainly based on the ppp. *sthita-*; those of *dhā* and *dā* either directly on *-(d)hita-* and *-dita-* (cf. Tedesco, JAOS 43.388), or patterned on *-(s)theti* to *sthita-*. Similarly from *mā*, tho no present **meti* appears recorded, the inf. *upametum* is doubtless based on the ppp. *upamita-*, on some such pattern as *jetum* to *jita-*; cf. Pali ger. *upametvā*. Probably the gerund forms implying *-cayati*, *-ceti* (Chap. 43, s.v. *ci* 2) are newly formed to ppp. *-cita*, not really inherited from Vedic *cayate*.

28.49. To the root *krī* a present *vi-kreti* (= AMg. *vikkei*) and a ger. *vi-kreya* occur; they are probably based on the ppp. *-krīta-*, on such a pattern as *neti* (Skt. *nayati*) to ppp. *nīta-*; or possibly on the inf. *-kretum*, as in the following (?).

28.50. More anomalous would seem the impv. 2 pl. *uc-chethā*, if it meant 'cut off!' (? but see Chap. 43, s.v. *chid* 3); and the gerund *acchetvā* (for *ā-ch°*; Pali *chetvā*), from *chid*. AMg. has *acche* (with *abbhe* from *bhid*, Āyār. 1.1.2.5), interpreted by Pischel 466 and 516 as an old aorist (Ved. **ā-cchet*), but used as an optative. I have the impression that such stray anomalies may have started from the infinitive, Skt. *chettum*, which appears in Pali as *chetum* (PTSD) and, interpreted as *che-tum*, may have led to ger. *che-tvā*, and then (possibly) to forms implying pres. **che-ti*.

Equally anomalous are the inf. *setum* and the gdve. *setavya*, both in MSV, from root *sīv*, which otherwise shows no certain forms or derivatives containing *e* except before *v*; but see Chap. 43, s.v. *sīv* (2).

Presents in *āti*

28.51. Like stems in *-eti*, and parallel to them, these form approximately a whole new conjugation (§ 24.11). Some of the presents that occur are based on Skt. root aorists: *dāmi*, *-dhāmi*, *-sthāmi*, on *adāt*, *adhāt*, *asthāt*. Further *bhāhi* 'fear' is modelled on *trāhi* (§ 28.23), and perhaps *prādurbhāmi* 'I appear' (for *°bhavāmi*) on its antonym *antardhāmi* (*°dadhāmi*) 'I disappear', but see Chap. 43, s.v. *bhū* (7).

28.52. To the strong present stem *dadhā-* are formed not only 2 pl. impv. *śrad-dadhādhvam*, but futures *-dadhāsyasi* and *-dadhāsye*, ppp. *-dadhāta-*, inf. *-dadhātum*, and gdve. *-dadhānīya-*.

28.53. Peculiar is the future *adattādāsyatha* (2 pl.: *mādattādāsyatha* 'do not steal!'), as if from the present *°dāti*; perhaps a kind of irregular denominative from *adattādāna* 'theft', with thought of the regular Skt. future (*ā-*)*dāsyati*; cf. *ādiyati*, which tho passive in form is active in meaning here and in Pali. In Pali *adinnaṃ ādiyati* 'steals', *adinnaṃ* is an unchangeable adverb; cf. Vin. iii.44.30–1 *rañño dārūni adinnaṃ ādiyissati* 'will steal the king's wood', id. 35 (*tvaṃ* ...) *rañño dārūni adinnaṃ ādiyi* 'you stole the king's wood'.

28.54. As we found above (§ 28.22) *ya*-presents substituted for root-presents in *ā(-ti)*, some traces of the reverse process also occur. The impv. *apacāhi* (= *apacāya*) implies an **apacāti* = *apacāyati*. The future *jāsyate* 'will be born' (Epic Skt. *jāsyati*) is based on the regular passive *jāyate* on a like model (e. g. *trāsyate* to *trāyate*). To *svādhyāyati* (denom.) are formed, similarly, fut. *svādhyāsyati* (besides *svādhyāyiṣyati*), gdve. *svādhyātavya-*, and a passive opt. *svādhyāyeta* 'would be studied', all implying a stem *svādhyā-*, pres. **svādhyāti*. From *palāyati* are formed past participles *palāta-* and *palāna-* (§§ 34.12, 19) besides regular *palāyita-*. Problematic are these passive forms of *vi-krī* 'sell': opt. *vikrāyetsuḥ*, and fut. *vikrāsyati* and *vikrāyiṣyati* (with the former cf. *jāsyate* above), §§ 31.3; 37.39.

28.55. These *ā*-stems of course, like *e*-stems, form aorists in *-si*; *adāsi* and *asthāsi* may be based on *dāmi*

and *-sthāmi, nir-vāsu* (*-vāṃsu*) on *-vāti*, and *-bhāsi* 'shone' on *bhāti* (if it is not rather connected with *bhās*, with ending *-i*); while *agāsi* 'sang' is based either on the Vedic aorist *agāsīt*, or on the rare Skt. present *gāti*. From *kṛ* occurs (*a*)*kāsi* (= Pali and AMg. id.), from Skt. *akārṣīt*. And fairly common in Mv is the interesting blend form *udapāsi* 'came into being', based on Skt. *ud-apādi* 'was produced', which has been drawn into the orbit of these *ā*-stems by changing final *-di* to *-si* (§ 32.60).

Presents in other long vowels

28.56. The few sporadic cases of new presents (and other verb forms) based on stems in other long vowels than *e* or *ā* have been sufficiently treated in §§ 24.12–14.

Non-thematic presents

28.57. New non-thematic stems hardly occur, except for the long-vowel stems mentioned in the preceding sections.

28.58. A 5th class impv. 2 pl. *aśnutha* 'eat' occurs once; a couple of such forms of the same root occur sporadically in Skt. (Chap. 43, s.v.). An apparent 8th class pres. of *hṛ*, *abhyuddharoti*, is recorded once, but may be a corruption for °*reti*; see § 28.18 and Chap. 43 s.v. *hṛ* (3). Note the anomalous *gumugumunti*, 3 pl. (Dict.).

28.59. Otherwise I know of non-thematic presents only as inherited from Skt. Many of these, however, must have been fully alive in the language, since to them are created new, non-Sanskritic forms showing confusion between strong and weak stems. See Geiger 140 ff. for the same phenomena in Pali; in Pkt. they appear to be much rarer, doubtless because non-thematic forms as a whole are less frequent.

28.60. Strong for weak stem forms. 2nd Class: Root *as*: 1 pl. *asmo* SP 147.9 (vs; v.l. *asma*, also *asme*, which would be a 1 pl. personal pronoun = *vayam*); LV 115.15 (vs; so both edd., but against all Lefm.'s mss.; very doubtful); opt. *asyā* etc., see § 29.41.

Root *i*: 3 pl. *enti* (to *eti*) LV 74.11; 173.5; Mv i.299.7; RP 5.10; Gv 34.12 (all vss); impv. 3 pl. *samabhyupaintu* Divy 399.9 (vs; vv.ll. °*entu*, °*antu*; °*pa-yantu* would be unmetr.); *entu* Mv iii.206.15 (prose).

Root *brū*: impv. 2 sg. *bravīhi* SP 93.11 (Kashgar rec.; ed. with Nep. mss. *vadesi*); Mv i.150.15 (mss.); 277.17; 280.7; RP 42.12 (all vss).

Root *vid*: 2 pl. *vettha* LV 125.7 (vs; so Calc. and all mss. except A, *vittha*, which Lefm. reads).

Root *śī*: 3 pl. *śenti* (Skt. *śerate*) Ud xvii.4; impv. 2 sg. *śehī* (or *sehī*; so Tib., rmi, sleep; mss. *mehi* or *mehī*) LV 196.10. But these forms may belong to (Epic) Skt. *śayati*.

28.61. Third class: Root *dā*: 2 sg. impv. *dadāhi* SP 88.8 (vs) etc.; common, but may be classed as belonging to thematic stem *dada-* with ending *-āhi*. And others of its type.

Root *dhā*: 2 pl. impv. *śraddadhādhvam* SP 44.3 (prose); both edd., no v.l. But the stem *-dadhā-* is also used outside of the present system (§ 28.52).

28.62. Fifth and Eighth classes: Root *āp*: 3 pl. *prāpnonti* Mv i.160.5 (vs)? So Senart, as sense seems to require; mss. *prāpnoti* (perhaps 3 sg. used as 3 pl., § 25.10).

Root *kṛ* (chiefly vss): 3 pl. *karonti* SP 84.6, 14; 85.7; 87.2; 95.11; LV 195.10; 260.4; 282.12, etc.; 1 pl. *karoma* SP 116.9; 2 pl. (usually impv.) *karotha* SP 48.9; 87.9 (Kashgar rec.); 197.1; LV 275.20; °*thā* LV 37.19; *prakarotha* LV 43.15, etc.; 3 pl. *namaskaronti* KP 84.9 (prose); impv. *karohi* (v.l. *karotha*) SP 113.14; *karontu* Mv i.295.1; ii.93.7; pple. nom. pl. *karontāś* SP 83.14; — *karoma* is used (for Skt. *karavāma*) as 1 pl. impv. in LV 47.14, 19 (in the latter read *kapilāhvaya*, acc., *taṃ karoma*), 21. Also impv. 2 sg., § 30.9.

Root *ci* (vss): 3 pl. *upacinontī* Śikṣ 4.5; read *upacinonti* Śikṣ 4.4 (metr. required, for °*cinvanti*).

Root *vṛ* (vss): 2 sg. impv. *apāvṛṇohī* SP 191.10; 2 pl. impv. *prāvṛṇothā* LV 80.2.

Root *śak*: 3 pl. *śaknonti* Mv iii.74.6; 1 pl. *śaknoma*(*ḥ*, before vowel) Mv iii.427.2; 2 pl. *śaknotha* Mv i.313.9 (all prose).

Root *śru* (mostly vss): 3 pl. *śṛṇontī* (m.c., with v.l. and WT; KN °*ti*) SP 91.6 (note *śṛṇvanti* 92.1); 282.7; 325.7; 2 pl. indic. or impv. *śṛṇotha* SP 128.3; 197.6; 292.14; LV 47.5; 151.21; 296.2 (*ni-ś*°); 1 pl. *śṛṇoma*(*ḥ*, before vowel) Mv i.289.1 (prose); *śṛṇoma* (before consonant) Mv ii.79.9; 3 pl. mid. *śṛṇonta* (for °*te*, before vowel) Gv 236.11; impv. 2 sg. *śṛṇohi* SP 93.14; 94.2; 352.6; LV 235.22 (prob. read *niśṛṇohi* with Lefm.); Mv i.184.1; ii.135.16; 256.13; 327.19; iii.453.12; Suv 17.11.

28.63. Ninth class (all forms could, however, be interpreted as derived from thematic stem with lengthened thematic vowel; cf. § 30.6; only vss):

Root *grah*: 2 sg. impv. *pratigṛhṇāhi* SP 177.13 (Kashgar rec.; ed. °*gṛhṇa*; both metrically good owing to a further change).

Root *jñā*: 2 pl. *jānātha* LV 314.16; 2 sg. impv. *jānāhi* SP 130.7 (v.l. *jānāsi*); *prajānāhi* SP 91.7.

28.64. Weak for strong stem forms (rare). Root *as*: 1 sg. *smi* Gv 231.5 (vs, after *ṃ*); 2 sg. *si* (for *asi*, after consonant) Mv iii.164.15; 207.8; both prose. May be enclitic forms; but cf. § 4.7.

Root *i*: 3 sg. *upeti* common, e. g. Mv iii.110.1; 6; 1 sg. *abhyupemi* Mv ii.105.7. May well be regarded as a phonetic Prakritism, *e* for *ai*.

Root *kṛ* (vss): 1 sg *kurumi* LV 56.11; *kurumī* LV 221.1. The 1 pl. indic. is used as impv.: *kurvāma* LV 47.12.

Root *brū*: 1 sg. *brūmi*, to be read Mv i.280.14 etc. for *kruhi* (see Dict. under this; Senart sometimes reads so, e. g. ii.50.2; iii.110.15; iii.457.3; in the last two, one ms. reads *brumi*).

Root *stu*: 3 sg. *stuti* (?), Dict.

29. Optative

29.1. Most optatives are based on thematic present stems, which as usual may be MIndic in origin. The following summarizes our finds, aside from regular Skt. forms:

1 sg. *bhaṇe*, m.c. *bhavi*; *vrajeyā*, *bhaveya*, *bhaveyyā*; *deśaya* (?)
2 sg. *pṛcche*, m.c. *hiṃsi*; *abhijāneyā*; *bhavesi*; *smareyāsi*; *satkareyyāsi*
3 sg. *bhave*, m. c. *bhavi*; *bhaveya*, *bhaveyā*, *bhaveyyā*, *bhaveyya*, *bhaveyaṃ*, *bhaveyo*(?); *bhaviya*
1 pl. *māpaye*; *bhaveya*; *bhaveyāma*, *parityajeyāmaḥ*; *śruṇiyāma*, *parivrajiyāmaḥ*
2 pl. *bhavetha*; *bhaṇeyātha*
3 pl. *bhaveyu*; *bhave*; *bhidyeya*; *bhavetsuḥ*, *manyetsu*, *paribhavensuḥ*, *syanditsuḥ*

On the endings 1 pl. (*e*)*matha*, 2 pl. *tha* for *ta*, and 3 pl. (*y*)*u* for (*y*)*us*, see §§ 26.10, 15, 19. On the alleged 1 sg. opt. ending *ehaṃ*, §§ 31.21, 22.

29.2. The really common and standard endings are *e* (or m.c. *i*), and *eya*, *eyā*. Both are used for 1, 2, 3 sg. and 1 and 3 pl.; but there are also specifically 1 and 2 pl. forms of the same type. Sometimes, as in Pali, *-yy-* for *-y-* occurs in the *eya*-type; and sometimes *i* replaces *e* in the same. There is also a specifically 3 pl. ending *etsu*(*ḥ*) or the like; and there are specifically 2 sg. forms in *esi* (rather common) and *eyāsi*, *eyyāsi* (as in Pali, but not common here).

29.3. After listing and discussing these forms we shall treat the remains of the athematic optative, which is commonest in forms of root *as* 'be'. As in Pali, this shows two types, *siyā* (also *siya*, *syā*) and *asyā*, *asya* (Pali *assa*); details below. Sporadically, other athematic optatives appear minus the final consonant (*dadyā* etc.), and in verses may shorten the vowel *ā* to *a* (*kurya* etc.). And there are a few other, miscellaneous forms belonging to the same general type.

Suppression of -*ay*- in stem, and the like

29.4. Ellipsis or telescoping of the syllable *-ay-* occurs in optatives from *aya* verbs, as in other present forms of such verbs. They are mostly causatives and denominatives, and as such will be treated under those headings; examples are *vācet* for *vācayet* SP 342.4 (vs), *katheyā* for *kathayeyā* SP 283.15 (vs); others will be included below at various places, and in § 38.27. Occasionally other presents in *-aya-* show similar forms: *vineya*, for *vinayeyaṃ*, 1 sg. opt. of *vi-nī*, Mv i.43.4 = 54.2 = 337.8 (vs, in the last passage printed as prose and emended to *vineyaṃ* by Senart). Somewhat similarly, *utthi* m.c. for *utthe*, 2 sg. opt. (impv.?) to pres. *uttheti*.

29.5. On a possible but very doubtful case of similar telescoping of the MIndic passive sign *-īy-*, see §§ 8.36, 37.33: LV 152.6 *janeyā* (for **janīyeyā*?).

Non-thematic middle endings in *aya* stems

29.6. The use of the athematic ending in the 3 sg. middle opt. especially of *aya* presents is well known in Skt., and occurs sometimes in our language too: *parivarjayīta* Śikṣ 114.18. See Whitney 1043 c (also 738 b), and Renou, BSL 41(1940).9–17. And *vilakṣayīta* SP 193.9 seems to be a form of this same sort, but used as a preterite (§ 32.105).

Heirs of thematic optative

29.7. As in Pali and Prakrit, a form ending in *e* (from Skt. *et*, *es*) is very common, most often as 3 sg., but also with other persons and numbers, especially 1 and 2 sg. Tho meter cannot be concerned in the substitution of this for regular Skt. *et*, *es*, the ending *e* is much commoner in verses than in prose even in Mv; it occurs also in the prose of Mmk, but otherwise seems to be limited to verses, according to our editions. It may be shortened to *i* in verses, almost invariably where meter requires a short syllable (the few exceptions are suspicious). But, in the mss. and editions of some texts, the spelling *e* is sometimes retained even where meter demands a short. These need not necessarily be regarded as text corruptions; *e* could denote a short vowel, § 3.64. On the alleged ending *eham*, taken by some as 1 sg. opt., see §§ 31.21, 22. On 2 sg. forms in *esi*, see §§ 29.20, 21. Occasionally the Skt. ending *et* is found with other than 3 sg. subjects (§§ 25.11–13). All examples are from verses except those marked prose.

29.8. 1 sg. e: *parāhaṇe* Mv i.42.8 (same by em. 53.9, where mss. unmetrically °*haṇeyaṃ*); in a parallel i.337.3, printed as prose, Senart prints °*haṇeyaṃ*, but mss. °*hate*, intending °*hane*; *śraddadhe* (could be 1 sg. indic. mid.) 178.18; *bhaṇe* 366.7 (as preceding); *saṃname* ii.93.9, *parivartaye* 10; *bhuṃje* 164.14; *parāmṛśe* iii.8.7, 9; *prapūraye* Suv 30.4 (v.l. °*yet*, °*ya*); *paśye* Bhad 25.

29.9. 1 sg. i: *bhavi* SP 11.2; 252.9; LV 199.16, 17, 18; Bhad 16, 27; read in Mv i.201.11 = ii.5.6 (vs) *śayanavaram āruhi* (1 sg.; or ger.?) *yatra kumudavasanasaṃnibhaṃ vimalaṃ*; *utsiṃci* Mv ii.92.6; *praśami* Sukh 23.5, *praśāmi* 6 (both for *praśamayeyam* or *praśām*°); *upanayi* 23.10; *deśayi* Suv 51.14; *vimocayi* 51.15; *deśayi* Bhad 18; *virāgayi* 24; *otari* 29, 30, 34; *abhinirhari* 34; *upasaṃkrami* 35; *pūrayi* 41; *jānayi* 45 (to *jānayati* = *janayati*, not to root *jñā* with Leumann); *kari* 58.

29.10. 2 sg. e: The forms noted here are, I believe, all injunctive (rather than conditional, 'potential') in meaning. More than once they are closely parallel to imperatives in the same context. The question may be raised whether they, or some of them, might not better be regarded as imperatives from *e*-presents, rather than historic optatives. Note specially *vade* 'speak thou!' SP 116.4; the present *vadeti* is familiar both here and in MIndic generally; also *utthi* for *utthe*, to *uttheti*, § 29.11. The usual 2 sg. impv. from *e*-presents ends, however, in *ehi* (also in Pali and Pkt.). The question is not of much importance, since the injunctive optative cannot really be distinguished from the imperative in meaning, even in Skt. Even in negative commands, the use of *mā* means nothing, for it is freely used with opt. forms in our language. Cf. the Ap. forms in *e* or *i*, called impv. by Hem. 4.387, whereas Pischel 461 and Jacobi, Sanatk. § 23 regard them as historic optatives.

vade SP 116.4; *vidhamaye* LV 117.6; *pṛcche* 231.17; *anuvicintaye* Laṅk 11.13 (prose); *nivartaye* Mv i.75.19;

ii.142.3; *vade* i.77.5; *udāhare* 77.6; *anukīrtaye* 77.8 (cf. *anukīrtaya* 77.3, most mss. °*yā*); *vyāhare* 276.11 (v.l. °*ret*); *nigṛhṇe*, *pragṛhṇe* 278.6, *saṃgṛhṇe* 7; *upasaṃkrame* 330.15 (prose; repetition of 330.13 where mss. °*kramya*, Senart em. °*krame*); *nivedaye* ii.37.12; *āgacche* (parallel with *preṣehi*, impv.) 90.2 (prose); *mā tvaṃ . . . gacche* (parallel with *preṣehi*, as in prec.) 169.17 (prose); *mā . . . kṛtaṃ na jāne*, 'do not fail to recognize (gratefully) what I have done (for you)' 184.8; *jaye* 322.7; *jane* (= *janaye*[*ḥ*]) 336.7; *prārthaye* 483.15; *darśaye* (parallel with *ehi*) iii.2.17; *mā . . . kilāmaye* (= *klāmayeḥ*) 19.15; *dahāpaye* (v.l. °*yet*) 20.8, *kāraye* 9, *āropaye* (mss. °*yet*) 10; *ghātaye* 387.13; *ālape* Śikṣ 100.16 (from Samādh); *mā . . . gile* Ud xxxi.31.

29.11. 2 sg. i: *utthi* 'arise!', m.c. for *utthe*, 2 sg. opt. (impv.?) to present *uttheti*; LV 236.4; 322.3; Gv 488.18; probably also in Gv 488.16 read *utthi ho* (= *aho*) for text *utthiho* (cf. § 32.7); *hiṃsi* Mv ii.236.6; *yāci* iii.419.5, mss.; vs but not metrically required; Senart em. *yāce*; *tvaṃ cari* (so ms., Finot em. *cara*) RP 39.4; *vardhayi* Gv 488.14.

29.12. 3 sg. e: *upasthape* (Kashgar rec. and WT) SP 88.12; *bhāṣe* 98.7; *dhāraye* 98.12; *dhāre* (= *dhārayet*) 255.10; 293.8; *pṛcche* 279.9; *kṣame* 334.15. — *bhave* LV 56.1; 138.12; *name* 120.9; *manye* 'would esteem' (Foucaux wrongly) 208.22; *suṣya* (= *śuṣyet*) *udadhiḥ . . . prapate* 330.3; in 386.17 read with best mss. *āhāram upanāmye 'yaṃ*, 'let him be offered (passive) food'. — *ācare* Mv i.12.14; *viroce* 70.7; *bhave* 155.9; *gacche* 274.18; ii.169.2; iii.373.17; *tyaje* i.310.12; *ārāgaye* ii.120.1 (prose; mss.); *āgacche* 121.8 (prose); iii.425.19 (prose); *abhinirgṛhṇe abhinipīḍe* (mss. °*ṣīde*) ii.124.6 (prose); *āgame* (to 'aorist' stem *āgama-*) ii.141.7, 8, 9, 10; iii.306.4; *bhave* ii.146.13 (prose); *bhāṣe* 257.15 (prose); 259.3 (prose); *anunade anurane* 282.12; 412.9 (prose); *janaye* 295.14 (prose); etc.— *bhave* Suv 31.12 (all mss., Nobel em. *bhaven*); *bhave* (ms., Finot em. *bhavet*) RP 13.14; *vimuhye* (v.l. °*yet*) Bhad 19; *abhilikhe* Mmk 63.25; 65.3 (both prose); *ālikhe* 66.21; *abhigacche* 82.9–10 (prose); *bṛṃhaye* Ud xviii.5 (later v.l. *bṛṃhayet*; possibly 2 sg. with Chakravarti); *prajahe* (later v.l. °*hed*) xx.2.

29.13. With *e* where meter requires short syllable (cf. § 3.64); *labhe* Mv ii.319.15, 17, 18 (3 pl.), 20, 21; 341.2; *jane* (= *janayet*) 378.15; 390.23; *apanaye* 393.13, 17, 20; *name* 395.11.

29.14. 3 sg. i: *anumodi* SP 58.6; *vraji* 111.2; *vadi* 98.7; *bhāṣi* 236.8, and so La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1074 at end of a pāda *bhāṣi* (*i* not required metrically) for 256.6 *bhāṣet* of both edd., no v.l.; *preṣayi* 113.6; *kārāpayi* 114.11; etc., common. — *bhavi* LV 42.11; 330.19 (read *bhavi yaḥ*); 356.2, 3; *pravarti* 48.11; *cintayi* 314.18; *rami* 325.8. — *vibuddhi* (= *vibudhyet*) Mv i.155.19; *jānayi* ii.324.19; *sthihi* 329.18; *kari* 374.13; *nirvāyi* (or aorist?) 375.8; *upagami* 387.15; *apanayi* 393.5; *varṣayi* iii.252.18. — *icchi* Samādh 8.7; *virāji* RP 54.20; *pravartayi*, *dharṣayi* Bhad 53; *dhārayi vācayi deśayi* (*i*)*to vā* 54 (ed. *deśayito* as one word); *dṛśi* Śikṣ 341.5; *prayuñji* 343.2 (see note); *adhiṣṭhihi* 343.13, 15; *darśayi* 343.14; *pravraji* Sukh 22.12.

29.15. 3 pl. e: *bhave* Mv ii.319.18; 328.18; *parāmṛṣe* 366.12 (for °*śe*).

29.16. 1 pl. ĕma: in LV 422.6 *bhavema*, both edd., no v.l.; the meter seems to demand short *e* in the penult, cf. § 3.65. On the very dubious *paricaremha* see § 26.7.

29.17. 1 pl. e: (*vayam . . .*) *māpaye* Mv i.351.19 (prose; so mss., Senart em. °*yemaḥ*).

29.18. 3 pl. etsu(ḥ), ensu(ḥ): a 3 pl. form, corresponding to the 3 sg. *e*(*t*), and according to the overwhelming testimony of the mss. ending in *etsuḥ* or (less often) *etsu*, occurs often in the Mv with optative meaning. The same form is also used as aorist, but most likely originated in the opt.; see §§ 32.95 ff. Rarely the mss. read *ensu*(*ḥ*) or *eṃsu*(*ḥ*); but Senart always reads one of these, usually the former; see my discussion l.c. A few examples of optative use of the form follow; all are taken from prose except those marked vs.

manyetsuḥ Mv i.39.4; 40.1; 60.8; 239.1 etc.; *śruṇetsuḥ* 42.12 (vs) = 53.7 = 337.2; *bhavetsuḥ* (twice), *vartetsuḥ* 61.3–5; *vyākaretsuḥ* 197.9; *vidyetsuḥ* 273.2; *upasaṃkrametsuḥ*, *saṃyujyetsu* (v.l. °*tsuḥ*) 314.6; *manyetsu*, *hāyetsu*, *abhivardhetsu* 330.7–10 (repeated 331.7–10; there are vv.ll. °*tsuḥ*, and once °*nsuḥ*); *abhiṣiṃcetsuḥ* 350.12; *pratiṣṭhāpayetsuḥ* ii.64.18; *bhavetsuḥ* 178.10; 241.20; iii.107.5; 162.3 etc.; *abhyokiretsuḥ* ii.131.6; *saṃmilāyetsuḥ* (root *mlā*; one ms. °*nsuḥ*) 178.8; *vahetsuḥ* 180.2 (v.l. °*nsuḥ*; in verse version of same passage 185.5 both mss. °*tsuḥ*); in 241.20, read *vikrāyetsuḥ* (pass. of *vi-krī*, see §§ 31.3; 37.39); *vihanyetsu* iii.36.12 (v.l. °*tsuḥ*); *budhyetsuḥ* (v.l. °*nsuḥ*) 74.2; *vuccetsuḥ* (pass. to *vac*) 194.12; *utpadyetsuḥ*, *deśayetsuḥ*, *hāyetsuḥ*, *abhivardhayetsuḥ* (repeated twice; sometimes v.l. *n* for *t*) 199.1 ff.; *chindetsuḥ*, *sampradāletsuḥ* 258.15, *pāṭayetsuḥ* (v.l. °*nsuḥ*) 17, *chindetsuḥ* 18; *prajāyetsuḥ* 317.8, *prajñāyetsuḥ* 9; *paribhavensuḥ*, *utpādayensuḥ* (v.l. in both °*tsuḥ*) 393.14.

29.19. The mss. also may show the ending *itsuḥ* (cf. the same in the aorist, § 32.38); *syanditsuḥ* (Senart em. °*nsuḥ*) Mv iii.317.8 (prose).

29.20. 2 sg. esi: Senart, Mv i.558, note on i.233.8, recognized a 2 sg. opt. ending *esi*, and explained it correctly as based on historic 2 sg. *e* (for *es*) exactly as Pali *eyyāsi*, Pkt. *ejjāsi*, is based on *eyya*, *ejjā* (cf. § 29.37); the 2 sg. pres. indic. ending is of course the source of the addition. The form seems not to be recognized elsewhere. Yet it occurs in Pkt., at least in Śākārī: *bhaṇeśi* 'you are to say', four times, Mṛcch. ed. Stenzler 21.8 and 20.

29.21. These forms in *esi* (always with dental *s*) are well authenticated in our language, even in prose in Mv, and in verses of other texts. Prose examples are so marked. *prakāśayesi* SP 98.2; *vadesi* 93.11; 98.4, 6 and 99.6; *paśyesi* 98.4; *upadarśayesi* 98.8. (Note in parallel formulas *saṃśrāvayes* 98.12, *śrāvayes* 97.8, 10, 14, *bhaṇes* 97.12.) In 99.4 perhaps read *prakāśayesi* with Kashgar rec. (ed. *prakāśayer idam* by em., Nep. mss. °*yed idam*, which need not be emended); in 209.8 perhaps read *kathayesi* with most Nep. mss. for ed. with Kashgar rec. *kathayāhi*. — *bhavesi* (parallel to *bhaveyaṃ* same line) Mv i.233.8 (prose); *vadesi* 254.16 (prose), *pṛcchesi . . . vadesi* 17 (prose); *jānesi* 275.17; *vandanaṃ vadesi* 'speak a greeting!' 323.19 (prose); *gacchesi* ii.42.17, *carayesi* 18 (mss. *var*°); *icchāmi . . . yaṃ . . . mama bhavanaṃ paśyesi* 179.18 (prose), 'I desire that you should see my house'; *vijānesi* (answer to 1 sg. *vijāneya*, line 6) 182.15; *pṛcchesi* 'ask!' (but v.l. *pṛcchasi*) 189.13 (prose); *vadesi* 194.12; iii.292.7 (repeated 18; 293.4, 9; 294.1); *āgamesi* ii.199.20; *kathayesi* 200.1; *gacchesi* 214.15, and *pṛcchesi* 16 (both prose; clearly injunctive; v.l. *gacchāsi*); *bhaṇesi* 224.7, 8; *upasthapesi* 247.10 (prose); *na . . . yācesi* 406.1, conditional, 'you would not be begging'; *jānesi* 449.6; 454.1; 457.16 (all prose); *kārāpayesi* 486.5 (prose); *upasthihesi* 491.12 (prose); *khādesi* iii.7.4, 8 (prose); *bhavesi* 27.14 (prose); *āgacchesi* (Senart em. °*ehi*) 159.5 (prose); *yadā bhagavaṃ . . . bhavesi* (10) *tadā . . . paribhuñjesi*, 311.9–10 (prose), 'when, Lord, you become . . . then make use of . . .'; *bhāṣesi* 384.16; *rakṣesi* 387.7 (v.l. *rakṣasi*, but opt. proved by parallel *kuryāsi* line 6 and opt. forms in same vs in Pali, Sn 702); *āgacchesi* 406.5 (prose); *paśyesi* Śikṣ 354.11.

29.22. So-called 'subjunctives' in āsi, āti. On such forms, apparently or supposedly with modal (sometimes potential) force, see § 27.4 ff.

eya, *eyā*, and cognate endings

29.23. From thematic present stems, our language very often shows optative forms (mostly 3 sg.) ending in *eya*, *eyā* (also *eyya*, *eyyā*, *eyaṃ*, *iya* etc.; forms with double

y are relatively rare). They are obviously to be connected with Pali *eyya* (Geiger 128), Pkt. *ejjā* (Pischel 459). In Pali, no **eyyā* is recorded, while in Pkt. *ejjā* seems to be the regular form; according to Pischel *ejja* only in verses, presumably where meter requires a short final, and in prose before enclitics.

29.24. To derive this ending directly from non-thematic 3 sg. forms in *yāt*, with Pischel, seems to me impossible. Geiger's view is much more reasonable, that it is analogical to 1 sg. *ey(y)aṃ* (Skt. *eyam*), and (perhaps also) 3 pl. *ey(y)u* (Skt. *eyuḥ*). But the athematic opt. endings Skt. *yām, yās, yāt* (MIndic *yaṃ, yā, yā*; also, at least in our dialect, *ya* for all three persons) provided the pattern on which 2 and 3 sg. *ey(y)ā, ey(y)a* were created to match 1 sg. *e(y)yaṃ*. To this extent Pischel's explanation contains an element of truth. There are even traces, tho rare and doubtful ones, of a semi-Sanskritic ending *eyāt*. For SP 102.9 (prose) *ācakṣed*, the Kashgar rec. reads *ācakṣeyād*; and at Mv ii.135.17 Senart reads *bhaveyāt*, at the end of a line of verse (but v.l. *bhaveyā*). Cf. also the endings 2 sg. *yāsi* and 3 sg. *yāti*, for Skt. *yās* and *yāt*, in original non-thematic optatives, and also preceded by the thematic mode-sign *-e-* (§§ 29.36–38, 41).

29.25. This theory would seem to imply that (as in Pkt. according to Pischel) the final *a* was originally long (tho in Pali it seems to be always short according to Geiger). In our dialect, however, both *ā* and *a* seem to be used interchangeably. That at any rate is true of the prose of Mv, where both are common; and in some other texts (such as KP and Ud), short *a* occurs either in prose or in metrically indifferent positions. On the other hand, some texts, notably SP and LV, which as presented in our editions do not use either form in prose, always or practically always use *eyā* in metrically indifferent positions (notably at the end of lines in SP), and *eya* only where meter requires a short final. The only exception I have noted in these two texts is SP 284.1 *nirdiśeya*, at the end of a line of verse; but the Kashgar rec. has *niḍarśayet* (with other changes).

29.26. From present stems in *aya*, the syllable *-ay-* may or may not appear before the *-ey-* of optative endings; cf. §§ 29.4; 38.27.

29.27. In the following examples, prose passages are marked as such; except Mv, most texts record the forms only in verses, or nearly so.

29.28. eya, eyā, 3 sg: SP: (length of ultima metrically determined) *vijñapeyā* 284.8; *bhaveyā* 313.7; — *bhaveya* 53.3; 195.7; *bhaṇeya* (v.l. °*yya*) 58.6; *kṣapeya* 111.14; *dadeya* 119.11; 229.4; *likheya, dhāreya, śruṇeya* 229.6; *vadeya* 229.10; 287.1; 352.3; *deśeya* 284.2; *prakāśeya* 296.2; *kalpeya* 344.2; *tarpeya* 351.4; *śruṇeya* 352.5; —(ultima metrically indifferent) *chādayeyā* 228.15; *saṃstaveyā* 229.11; *prakāśeyā* 237.2; *vadeyā* 254.6; *iccheyā* 278.8; *deśeyā* 280.9; *katheyā* 283.15; *vijñapeyā* 284.8; *prakāśayeyā* 284.11; *vadeyā* 293.6, etc.; — *nirdiśeya* 284.1 (cf. above).

LV: (metrically determined) *bhaveyā* LV 57.3; *phaleyā* 81.19; *janeyā* 152.6; *niṣkrameyā* 201.21; *abhiniṣkrameyā* 202.6; — *jareya* (for *jarayeya*) 74.3; *bhaveya* 141.4; *nyaseya* 151.8; *darśeya* 284.5; *dadeya* 288.4; *cāleya* 330.3; *kareya* 335.19; *gaṇeya* 338.7; *deśeya* 393.2 (for *deśayeya*); — (ultima metrically indifferent) *sthiheyā* 42.18; *āruheyā* 80.10; in 80.12, read *śruṇeyā* (or °*yyā*) for *śuṇeṣyā* of text; *bhaveyā* 200.7; *gaccheyā* 201.14; *vrajeyā* 201.18; *vindeyā* 201.22; *āgameyā* 232.18; *tārayeyā* 300.17, *āśvaseyā* 19; *parijānayeyā* 330.17.

Mv (prose) *bhaveyā* Mv i.60.8; 272.3; 311.18; 356.4; ii.65.16 etc. (in i.60.8 Senart em. °*yaṃ*; in i.272.4 *bhaveya*); *āgaccheyā* i.255.1; 284.10; (the first passage repeated with °*eya* i.256.13); *saṃyujyeyā* i.295.18 (mss. *saṃpūjy*°); *pragṛhṇeyā* 347.18; *mucyeyā* . . . *hanyeyā* 364.2; *anujāneyā* ii.119.15; *ākrameyā* 146.12 (twice), *hareyā* 13, *vipraveśeyā* 14; *rajyeyā kalpeyā pramadyeyā* 147.13, etc.; — *bhaveya* i.44.7; 61.6; 199.1; 273.12; ii.2.19 etc.; *gaccheya* i.258.13; *deśeya* 316.17; *upasaṃkrameya* 320.8; *khajjeya* (for *khādy*°, passive) ii.78.1; *āgaccheya* 102.17; *samanusmareya* 103.8; *dāleya saṃpradāleya chindeya* 125.4–5; *budhyeya* 160.5; *hareya, bandheya* 178.16; *upasthiheya* 214.6; *śobheya* iii.10.16; *parivarteya* 32.2, etc.;—(vss, final determined by meter) *pateyā* ii.324.21; 329.17; *abhyuddhareyā* 393.8, *dadeyā* 18, etc.; — *ṛdhyeya* i.299.14; *iccheya* 359.10, 14; *parīkṣeya* ii.67.7; *śoṣeya* 329.7; *muñceya* 331.1, etc.

(Prose) *vindeya* (text *bi*°) and (?) *vāpeya* KP 158.3; *śruṇeya* 159.17, *parikṣipeya* 18.

bhaveyā Mmk 168.9, 10 (dodhaka vs).

bhāṣeya, vihiṃseya Ud viii.12; *iccheya* xvi.14; *viprajaheya* xx.1. All in vss, but only in xx.1 does meter require short final. All are found in the most ancient ms.; later mss. replace all by forms in *eta* or *et*. Cf. § 1.43.

29.29. eya, eyā, other than 3 sg.: As usual, these forms are used for other persons and numbers. It may be noted that *eya* as 1 sg. could be interpreted as historically identical with the Skt. 1 sg. opt. middle ending. I doubt whether this would be a realistic view to take of the ending, in view of the relative rarity of middle endings, and the frequency of the use of 3 sg. forms as 1 sg. and also of the phonetic alteration of final *aṃ* to *a*. Note e. g. Suv 37.6 ff., where we find a long series of 1 sg. opt. forms (*bhaveya* etc.), in *eya* where the meter favors a short final, but in *eyaṃ* where it favors a long (37.19 *anusmareyaṃ*, 38.3 *vivarjayeyaṃ*). As this suggests, the fact that any final *am* may become *a*, at least in verses m.c., may have played a part in the use of *eya* as 1 sg. (for Skt. *eyam*). But note that *eyā* is also so used, and even in prose.

1 sg. *eyā*: *vrajeyā* LV 78.7 (vs); *bhāṣeyā* Mv ii.180.2, *jāneyā* 3 (both prose); *śakyeyā* 249.1 (prose); *nikhaneyā* (Senart em. °*yaṃ*) 436.3 (prose); *labheyā* Bhad 59 (vs).

1 sg. *eya* (vss except those marked prose): *āgaccheya* Mv i.186.10; *iccheya* ii.70.6 (prose); *gaccheya* 170.4 (prose); 205.18; *vijāneya* 182.6; *bhaveya* (Senart em. *bhave*, m.c.) 299.13; *careya* 299.14, *varjeya, seveya* 15 (Senart em. *varje* m.c.; he keeps *seveya*, to which there is just as much metrical objection); *grāheya* 330.18; *kareya* 424.17 (prose).

2 sg. *eyā*: *abhijāneyā* Mv i.75.10 (vs); *parirakṣeyā* 277.8 (vs).

1 pl. *eya*: *vayaṃ pi bhaveya* Mv iii.138.9 (prose; so mss., Senart em. *bhavema*; to be sure mss. have *bhavema* in the same sentence, line 11).

3 pl. *eya*: *chidyeya bhidyeya* Śukh 45.13 (vs).

29.30. eyya, eyyā: In mss. and sometimes in printed editions the *y* in this ending may be written double, as in Pali (and Pkt. *ejjā*). The misspelling *eryyā, eryya* is also recorded. *ākrameyyā* (apparently all mss. have *yy*; v.l. °*eryyā*) LV 199.15 (vs); *bhaveyyā* (v.l. °*eṣyā*) Mv i.331.8 (prose); *prayojeyyā* (v.l. °*eyā*) 279.16 (vs); *anujāneyyā* 351.18 (prose); *krīḍeyyā rameyyā* (v.l. °*eyā*) *pravicāreyyā* (v.l. °*eyā*) . . . *kareyyā* ii.144.9–10 (prose); *kareyyā* 144.16 (prose); *bhasmīkareyyā* (Senart em. °*eyā*) 178.4 (prose); *vadeyya* (v.l. °*eyyā*, both times) 233.13, 18 (prose); *bhaveyyā* (v.l. in all °*eyā*) Bhad 8, 23, 24, 46 (vss); *bhaveyya* (v.l. °*eya*) 45; *vadeyya* Dbh.g. 12(348).9.

As 1 sg., *prakāśeyyā* (v.l. °*eyā*) Mv i.336.20 (vs); in same vs i.53.4 mss. °*eyyā*, Senart em. °*eyyaṃ*; in i.42.11 = 53.6 = 337.1 (vs, in 337.1 printed as prose), prob. read in all *niveśeyyā* (with Senart in 337.1, and most mss. in 53.6); read so also in i.337.4 (vs, printed as prose); *bhaveyyā* Bhad 16 (vs; v.l. °*eyā*).

29.31. eyaṃ as 3 sg.: The historic 1 sg. ending *eyaṃ* is, in the mss. of Mv at least, fairly often used as a 3 sg. Senart always emends to *eya*, but I doubt whether he is right. The ending *eyaṃ* as 3 sg. could easily be an analogical reflex of the use of *eya* as both 3 and 1 sg., the forms of the two persons being interchangeable to a

large extent. At any rate I record here a number of cases, mostly in prose (others are marked vs): *utpadyeyaṃ* Mv i.44.15; *bhaveyaṃ* i.145.17 = 202.14 (vs; here meter seems to favor *bhaveya*; yet the same vs ii.6.11 reads *bhaveyā*, kept by Senart); *yeyaṃ* ii.233.3; *upapadyeyaṃ* iii.43.11; *avatārayeyaṃ* 92.5; *bhasmīkareyaṃ* 158.6; *anuśāseyaṃ* 215.2; *kathayeyaṃ* 390.10; *saṃyujyeyaṃ* 406.12; *vaseyaṃ* 432.19; *deśeyaṃ* 437.8; *bhāveyaṃ* 456.21 (vs).

29.32. eyo 3 sg. (?): More doubtful is the ending *eyo*, sometimes found in the mss., usually as 3 sg., e. g. Mv ii.70.2 *bhaveyo* (Senart em. °*ya*); *prapateyo* (Senart em. °*yā*; both these are prose) ii.179.20; and others. It might represent **eyas*, a theoretically 2 sg. form (which would be analogical to 1 sg. *eyaṃ*, on the model of imperfect indicatives), used as 3 sg. But perhaps Senart is right in taking it to be a mere corruption.

29.33. eyāma(s), eyātha, 1 and 2 pl.: To this same pattern belong the 1 pl. ending *eyāma(s)* and the 2 pl. *eyātha* (Pali *eyyāma, eyyātha*): in SP 163.2 (vs), read with Kashgar rec. *anuprāpuneyāma* for ed. *anuprāpnuyāmo 'tha* (the patchword *'tha* proves that the semi-Sanskritized form is secondary); *bhaveyāma* Mv i.44.8 (prose); *parityajeyāma* (v.l. °*tyaje*) 313.6 (prose); *parityajeyāmaḥ* ii.105.13 (end of line of vs). — *pṛccheyātha* (v.l. °*yatha*) Mv ii.102.18 (prose); *bhaṇeyātha* 105.4 (vs).

29.34. iyā, iya, iyāma(s): Any of the preceding endings may occasionally be read with *i* instead of *e* before the *y*. Usually such forms appear in verses where meter requires a short syllable instead of *e*, so that *i* may be considered a shortening of *e*, m.c. But sometimes Mv mss. have such forms even in prose, as in the two Mv citations below. All the others here cited are from verses. *tiṣṭhiya* SP 251.6; *bhaviya* LV 78.11; *śruṇiyāma* (*'tha*) 364.11; *pravrajiyāmaḥ* Mv ii.234.1 (prose; Senart em. °*eyāmaḥ*); in iii.30.8, read with mss. *okaṭṭiyāti* (or °*ṭiyā*; Senart em. *okaḍḍheyā*); *paśyiya* Suv 52.5 (em., mss. mostly *paśyami*, the best one *pasiya*); *paśyiya* Bhad 28, 33, 57 (in 28 as 1 sg.); *vibudhyiya* 41 (1 sg.).

29.35. aya (?), **1 sg.**: In Mv i.43.3 = 54.1 = 337.7 (vs, in 337.7 printed as prose) *devamanuṣyāṇāṃ deśaya dharmam* seems to be the reading intended by the mss. (they read mostly *deśaya* or *deśaye*, except at 54.1 where mostly *deśeya* or °*yaṃ*), 'may I preach the law to gods and men'. Meter seems to require — ⏑ ⏑; Senart em. *deśiya* (in 337.7 *deśeyaṃ*) which he interprets as a gerund (implausibly). Parallel with *vineya*, in next line, 'may I train . . .', 1 sg. opt. to *vineti* = *vinayati*; *vineya* is telescoped for *vinayeya*, and probably has led to the nonce-analogical-creation *deśaya* (*vineti* : *vineya* = *deśayati* : *deśaya*). However, the meter is questionable; there may be a corruption.

29.36. 2 sg. (e)y(y)āsi: Clearly similar to *esi* (§ 29.20) in origin are 2 sg. optatives in *yāsi*, *e(y)yāsi*. The first is recorded in *kuryāsi* = Skt. *kuryās*, Mv i.276.8; 277.2; 278.1; 279.5 (here mss. °*asi*, °*osi*); iii.160.6 (prose, in a *mā* clause); 387.6; Śikṣ 100.16 (*kuryāsī*, *ī* m.c.) and 101.2 (all but one of these in verses). Cf. *siyāti* = *syāt*, § 29.41.

29.37. The ending *eyāsi* is a similar extension of *eyā* (*eya*), above. It is paralleled in Pali *eyyāsi*, Pkt. *ejjāsi* (also *ejjasi*), but is rare in our dialect: *jāneyāsi* Mv ii.488.15 (prose; v.l. *jānesi*); *smareyāsi* iii.20.12 (vs), 'you are to remember'; *pithiyeyāsi* 25.6 (prose), so read with 1 ms. (v.l. *pihi*°), 'you are to cause to be covered over'.

29.38. The same occurs with *yy*, as in Pali (cf. § 29.30); *saṃlapeyyāsi* Śikṣ 100.16, *satkareyyāsi* 17 (both vss).

Non-thematic optatives

29.39. Forms of root as, 'to be'. In Pkt. this root has, according to Pischel 464, 498, only in AMg., an opt. *siyā* = Skt. *syāt*. In Pali the opt. of this root is better preserved. Geiger 141 records 1 sg. *siyaṃ* and 3 sg. *siyā*, but also 1 sg. *assaṃ* and 2 and 3 sg. *assa* (besides plural forms). The latter type represents a Skt. **asyām*, **asyās*, **asyāt*, with spread of the strong stem from the indicative singular.

29.40. Our language has forms corresponding to both these Pali types. So *siyā* as 3 sg., and *siya* in verses m.c. as 3 sg., 1 sg., and 3 pl.; also *syā*, the Skt. form but for lack of final *t*, and *siyāti*, with indicative endings as in Pali *labheyyāti* etc. (Geiger 127); tho *siyāti* is not recorded for Pali or Pkt., it has correspondents in the Aśokan inscriptions, Hultzsch, lxxxii and 40 note 1. There is also an astonishing form *stiya* (?), on which see below. Of the other type we find *asyā* not only as 3 sg. but as 1 and 2 sg. and 3 pl.; also *asyāt*, semi-Sanskrit, and *asya*, only in verses but, according to the mss., not exclusively m.c. (sometimes at the end of lines where meter is indifferent). No specifically 1 sg. form *siyām* or *asyām*, or the like, seems to be recorded.

29.41. *siyā* (only vss): 3 sg. Mv ii.353.15; iii.1.15; 365.7.

siya (only vss, and apparently *ă* only m.c.): 3 sg. LV 271.4; Mv ii.331.10, 14; 332.4, 8; Sukh 22.7; 50.12; 3 pl. Mv ii.340.12 (Senart em. *siyu*); 1 sg. Mv ii.396.18; Sukh 22.5; Śikṣ 302.3, parallel to Mv ii.375.10, where mss. (*katha*) *yasi*, read *siya*!

siyāti (see above): Mv i.45.1 (prose), read *siyāti* for Senart *siyā ti* (interpreted as = *te*, but this *ti* never occurs except in verses m.c.); 358.13 (vs), read *siyāti snehā*, with mss., for Senart *siyātisneho*; proved by the same vs in Pali, Sn 36, *bhavanti snehā* (so read); *siyāti* 3 pl. = Pali *bhavanti*.

syā: 3 sg. Mv iii.314.6 and 17 (both prose; after *-e*, could be interpreted as *asyā*, below).

stiya (!): 3 sg. Śikṣ 115.2, 3 (vss) *yatra prapañco stiya vigraho vā . . . muhūrtamātraṃ stiya yatra kleśaḥ*. It seems impossible to interpret as (*a*)*sti ya*(*ḥ*), and the repetition makes one hesitate to assume a corruption. No MIndic form **thiya* or **ṭhiya* (or °*yā*; the short *a* may be m.c.) has been discovered. If correct, the form would seem to be a blend of opt. *siya* (*siyā*) with indic. **sti* (= *asti*; cf. AMg. *tthu*, 3 sg. impv., Pischel 498). Note that in the first occurrence the form follows final *-o*.

asyāt: 3 sg. (all prose) Mv i.286.13 (v.l. *asya*); ii.67.8; 68.13; 81.17, 20; 313.17; iii.440.11, etc.

asyā: 3 sg. SP 335.10 (vs, so with Kashgar rec.); Mv i.42.10 = 53.5 (vs) = 337.1 (here printed as prose; mss. here *asyān*, *asmān*, Senart em. *asyāt*); Mv i.213.14 = ii.16.19 (? the first, where mss. read *asyāḥ*, printed as prose, the second, where mss. *asyā* after *-e*, printed as vs; possibly *asyāḥ*, gen. sg. fem. of *ayam*, is intended); i.277.10 (vs, 3 sg., read *janādhipaḥ* with mss.); 290.3 (prose); ii.64.2 (prose, v.l. *asyād*); 204.17 (vs); as 1 sg. Mv i.42.6 = 53.3 = 336.19 (vs; in the first, mss. and ed. *asya*, without metrical necessity, at the end of an *āryā* line; in the others mss. *asyā*, Senart em. *asyāṃ*); as 2 sg. Mv ii.406.1 (vs); as 3 pl. SP 197.4 (vs).

asya: 3 sg. (only in vss, but rarely where meter demands short ultima) Mv ii.228.9; iii.1.16; 124.3.

29.42. Other athematic optatives in yā. ya. Even in prose of Mv, and in verses elsewhere, the final *t* or *m* of the 3 or 1 sg. may be lost as in MIndic; and the *ā* may be shortened in verses where meter requires it.

yā, 3 sg.: *dadyā* Mv i.80.6 (prose); iii.420.1 (vs, = Pali *dajjā* in the same vs, Jāt. iii.355.7); *sameyā* Mv ii.404.8 (vs); *ṛdhyā* Mv iii.335.18; 336.7 (both prose); *nigṛhṇīyā* Mv i.347.18 (prose); in Mv i.156.7 (vs) Senart *kuryā* (v.l. *kuryād*), but as his note observes, meter requires *kurya*.

yā, 1 sg.: *śṛṇuyā* LV 42.19 (vs; two mss. with Calc. °*yāṃ*).

ya (only vss, m.c.), 3 sg.: *kurya* SP 157.12 (cf. Mv

i.156.7 above); *śruṇuya* LV 54.2; *pravilīya* (so read with best mss. for ed. °*līyu*) LV 330.19 (3 sg. opt., or 'precative', for °*yāt*; 'the heart of him who might be [*bhavi yaḥ*] passionate would melt', *pra-vi-lī*, intrans.); *upeya* Mv iii.369.21; as 1 sg., *kurya* Bhad 47 (v.l. *dadyu*, apparently for *dadyām*!).

29.43. Miscellaneous athematic optatives. A 2 pl. opt. *dadyatha* occurs in Mv ii.105.3 (vs): 'you are to give'. So the mss., with metrical correctness; Senart em. *dāsyātha* (metrically bad). The form of the mss. is correct; it is a 2 pl. to a MIndic *dajjaṃ* (= *dadyām*, as in Pali) with thematic short *a* (or merely m.c. for *ā*?), exactly like Pali 2 pl. opt. *assatha* to *assaṃ*, *assa* (Geiger 141).—In SP 102.12 (prose), for ed. *bhaveyaṃ*, the true reading (see KN note) seems to have been probably *bhūyāṃ*, a 1 sg. 'precative' analogical to *bhūyās*, *bhūyāt* (Skt. *bhūyāsam*).

29.44. According to Lefmann's ed. LV 444.2 (vs) has *vadyād*, 3 sg. opt. of *vad* = Pali *vajjā* (Geiger 143 d). So ms. A; but other mss. and Calc. *dadyād*; according to Foucaux, Tib. 'comprend', which, F. suggests (in Notes 210), points to *dadhyād*. The Tib. is ḥdzin (commonly = Skt. *dhar-*) byed, 'make grasp' or the like; *dadhātu* line 4 (Tib. 'comprendra', Foucaux) is rendered by the related gzuṅ (bar bya), which gives some support to F.

29.45. In Gv 522.16 (prose) *śṛṇyāt* may be a mere corruption for *śṛṇuyāt*.

29.46. In SP 230.4 (vs) *śruṇo* is read with two mss.; two others *śṛṇod* or *śuṇod*; meaning is 3 sg. opt.; conceivably based on the strong stem *śruṇo-* (in whatever phonetic guise) on the analogy of thematic optatives in *-e*(*d*). But see § 32.124.

29.47. In Mv i.69.18 (vs) the mss. present *krāyur*, which Senart emends to *kreyur*, allegedly a 3 pl. opt. (for *kareyur*? at any rate supposed to be from *kṛ* 'make'). Senart's form is as monstrous and unprecedented as that of the mss. Possibly read *karyur*, which would match Pali *kayirā* = **karyāt* (Geiger 149 d)?

29.48. On *kuryāsi* for *kuryās* see § 29.36.

30. Imperative

30.1. Our section on the imperative is relatively brief and contains little of interest except for the spread of the 2 sg. ending *hi* (or m.c. *hī*, § 26.2) far beyond its Skt. limits, as described just below. Otherwise we shall note a few odds and ends of endings, mostly containing no surprises; but it is worth remark that the 2 sg. (originally middle) ending *su*, common in Pkt. and (in the form *ssu*) in Pali, hardly occurs here. On *i* for thematic *a*, not limited to imperatives, see § 27.10.

Spread of 2 singular ending *hi*

30.2. As in Pali and Prakrit, the ending *hi* is used much more extensively than in Sanskrit. Stems in *aya* (*e*), both causatives and denominatives and others (such as *nayati*), very commonly have 2 sg. impv. in *ehi*. (There are also, from such stems, 2 sg. forms ending in *e*, or m.c. *i*, which have injunctive force, and which I have grouped with the optative; see § 29.10 on the rather fruitless question whether it might be better to call them imperatives.) This ending also spreads to other thematic stems. But much commoner with them is the ending *āhi*, as in Pali and AMg., where the penultimate vowel is reported to be always long. In our dialect too it is usually long. But *ahi*, which Pischel records only in Ap. and regards as a shortening of *āhi*, is found many times in LV, tho only in verses. Elsewhere it is rare; but the prose of Mv shows it a few times, so that it can hardly be due exclusively to metrical shortening. Finally, *hi* is sometimes found after other vowels than *e*, *ā*, *a* (chiefly *o*, but *kuruhi* also occurs). Sometimes the final *i* is lengthened in verses m.c. All examples are from verses except in the case of Mv, from which only prose examples are cited unless the contrary is indicated by (vs).

30.3. ehi or m.c. ehī (with e for Skt. aya): *janehi* SP 15.12; *vyapanehi* (= *vyapanaya*) 15.12; 49.1; *deśehi* 167.5, 6 etc.; *tārehi* 167.6; 170.15; *mocehi* 174.4; *tarpehi* 190.12; *dhārehi* 209.7. — *pālehi* LV 79.17; *tarpehī* (*ī* m.c.) 164.10; *bodhehi* 177.22; *vicintehi* 184.2, 18; *udīrehi* 185.16; *sehī* or *śehī* (mss. *mehī*; ? see § 28.60) 196.10; *janehi* 237.1; *samehi* (= *śamaya*) 359.11; 414.13; *vinehi* 370.16.—Mv (all prose): *utpādehi* Mv i.233.10; *anujānāpehi* 256.14; *niveṣṭāvehi* (so read) 273.14; *ārocehi* 287.10, *yācehi* 11; *bhojehi* 309.10; *millehi* 363.14; iii.291.17 (with mss.), and *mellehi* ii.448.4; 454.16; *preṣehi* i.362.17; *visarjehi* 363.9; *varehi* ii.70.4; *kārāpehi* 73.18; *adhyāpehi* 77.16; *paricārehi* 103.6; *pravicārehi* 14; *āṇapehi* 108.15; *nehi* 108.16; 428.16, etc., common.

30.4. ihi for ehi (?), probably textual error: In Mv ii.340.5 (vs) the mss. have *utthihi* 'arise!'; but the meter requires a long penult; Senart em. to *utthāhi*, but *utthehi* is more likely, to present stem *utthe*(-*ti*).

30.5. ehi (with e for Skt. a). Here are presented some examples of this ending analogically attached to stems which, in Skt., would not contain *aya*; or if they would, -*ay*- is preserved before *ehi* as in *dhārāpayehi* 'cause to hold' Mv ii.447.14 (prose; so mss.; Senart em. *dhārāpaye*). Such cases are important because *e* in them is clearly not a MIndic phonetic resultant from -*aya*-. Some of the other cases, like *vadehi*, familiarly show in MIndic, and in our language, presents like *vadeti* and other forms from stems in -*e*-. With the qualified exception of such cases (even they, of course, also show regular Skt. presents like *vadati*), all examples are based on thematic presents (some MIndic) in *ati*. Examples not marked (vs) are from prose:

gacchehi Mv i.187.1, and *paśyehi* 4 (both vss; so all mss., Senart em. °*āhi*); *vadehi* 324.10; 330.12; iii.159.4; 173.18; *āgamehi* ii.31.20; iii.161.10; 186.17 (from 'aorist' stem *āgama*-); *upasevehi* ii.103.13; *samanuśāsehi* 103.14 (Pali has *anusāseti* beside °*ati*); *nivartehi* (not caus.) 105.8 (vs); *āvasehi* 405.9 (vs); *dhārāpayehi* 447.14; *śruṇehi* iii.140.13 (vs); *utkaṇṭhehi* 'grieve' (an *a*, not *aya*, stem; note *utkaṇṭhantasya* in preceding line) 167.9; *prāpuṇehi* 172.11; *pratigṛhṇehi* 211.10 (vs); *prāpuṇehi* 270.14 (vs) (so mss., Senart em. °*āhi*; in line 16 Senart *prāpuṇāhi* with one ms., the other °*ehi*).

30.6. āhi or (m.c.) āhī. Cf. § 30.2. Chiefly in verses except in Mv, where it is extremely common in prose and vss alike. Our Mv examples are all from prose; others are from vss except as specified. All from thematic stems:

bhavāhi SP 32.15 (and read so with Kashgar rec. in 274.8, cf. critical note and La Vallée Poussin, JRAS 1911.1077); *dadāhi* (to *dadati*) 88.8; read with Kashgar rec. *bhaṇāhi* 98.6 and 99.6; *bhāṣāhi* 98.4; *parāhanāhi* 178.10; *pradarśayāhi* 178.11. — *anugṛhṇāhi* 'favor, have mercy on' (not 'receive' with Suzuki) Laṅk 4.15; *vadāhi* 27.6; 200.13. — *bhaṇāhi* LV 56.12; 114.22; 304.1 etc.; *bhaṇāhī* 233.1; *dadāhi* 94.18; 220.16; *dadāhī* 233.8; *niṣkramyāhī* 162.10; *smarāhi* 172.17; 185.15; *vrajāhī* 233.12; *vasāhi* 241.18, 21, 22.—Mv (prose): *nivartāhi* Mv i.270.14; ii.107.11, 16; *yācāhi* i.289.6; 349.1; *parityajāhi* 310.7; *abhiṣiñcāhi* 349.7, 10; *gacchāhi* 362.11 ff. (repeatedly); 365.13, etc.; *bhāyāhi* 363.1; *upapadyāhi* ii.2.12; *snāyāhi* (to *snāyate*) 78.3; *āgacchāhi* 82.12; 271.10; *niṣīdāhi* 96.17; 107.3; *anusmarāhi* 103.4; *krīḍāhi*, *ramāhi* 103.6, 14 etc.; *abhiniṣkramāhi* 141.2; *cintayāhi* 146.4; *anubhavāhi* 146.5; 147.6; *anuprayacchāhi* 146.11 etc., very common. — *paśyāhi* Suv 60.3 (mss. corrupt); *dadāhi* 229.4; 249.4, 8; *bhavāhi* 232.2. — *bhavāhi* Kv 34.22 (prose? occurs in what may have been an anuṣṭubh pāda) and 24 (vs). — *avabhāsayāhi* Gv 54.12, *anuśāsayāhi* 16, and a long series of similar forms in the sequel; *janayāhi* 485.23. — *vidhunāhi*, *dadāhi* Sādh 4.16 (prose); *dadāhi* 7.11 (prose); 231.6 (vs); *trāyāhi* 162.10; *kāmāhi* 162.11, 19; 163.3; 543.9.

30.7. ahi or (m.c.) ahī. Rare except in LV, where it is quite common. Chiefly in vss, where meter requires short *a*, but a few times in Mv prose; these are so marked; other examples from vss. In a few cases editors print *hi* separately, taking it as the particle; this is usually impossible.

jinahi LV 12.19; *sevahi* 28.22; *bhaṇahi* 91.18; 141.3 (in the latter °*hī* seems metrically required); *vibhajahi* 165.8; *sthapayahi* 167.8; *varṣahī* 171.4; *deśayahī* 175.2; *upekṣahi*, *kurvahi* 178.6; *muñcahī*, *ṛddhyahi* (?) 178.10; *saṃtārayahī* 178.18; *upekṣahi* 178.22; *dadahī* 179.4; *bhavahī* 221.22; *rudahi* 231.10; *vahahi* 237.1; *rodahī* 237.9 (most mss. *rodihi*); *bhavahi* 241.20; *prekṣahi* 323.2; 328.16; *pravartayahī* 414.22. — *pramodyahi* Mv i.275.9 (for *pramodyasva*, pass. to *pramodayati*: 'be delighted, take delight');

gacchahi 288.1 (prose; v.l. °*ehi*); *upapadyahi* ii.2.10 (prose); *paśyahi* 447.2 (prose; Senart em. *paśyāhi*); iii.406.1 (prose); *pīṣahi* iii.3.17; *chindahi* 140.4. — *otarahi* Gv 301.5; in 485.22 and 487.2, *vandahi*, read with 2d ed. (*prīti*) *vindahi* 'find joy'; cf. *tuṣṭi vindi* 485.23; in 487.10 *prīti vandi* is printed but corrected to *vinda* in 2d ed.

30.8. [ahe, for ahi, ahī? In LV 210.4 (vs) *chandakā capalu* (Dict.) *mā vilambahe* is thus printed by Lefm., without v.l. on the last word. It is perhaps possible, but not very likely, that *he* (rather than *hī*) is m.c. for *hi*; at any rate, a monstrous quasi-middle imperative ending *he* (to *hi* = *se* : *si*, *te* : *ti*) seems hardly acceptable. Despite the position, at such a distance after the vocative *chandakā*, I think we should read *vilamba he*, the latter being the interjection: 'Chandaka, do not delay, ho there!' So Calc. prints it.]

30.9. ohi, or (m.c.) ohī; also uhi. Chiefly in 5th and 8th class presents, with strong stem instead of weak (§ 28.62); also *bhohi* to MIndic *bhoti* = *bhavati*. Only in verses in most texts; in Mv also in prose (examples are marked prose):

karohi SP 113.14 (v.l. *karotha*); Mv i.276.1; (the rest prose) i.312.1; ii.146.6; 174.1; 214.13; 215.3; 297.7 etc.; *vyākarohī* SP 15.12 (so read with all Nep. mss. and WT); Sukh 52.7; *vyākarohi* Mv ii.296.3 (prose); *prakarohi* LV 199.4; *apāvṛṇohī* SP 191.10; *śṛṇohi*, see § 28.62; *bhohi* LV 237.9; Suv 12.4; Mv ii.236.16; iii.3.17; 5.14.

But also, instead of Skt. *kuru*, *kuruhi* Mv i.275.22; 277.13 = 280.1 = 281.20. And according to the mss. *kruhi* (!) Mv, but read *brūhi* (or *brūmi*); see Dict. s.v. *kruhi*.

30.10. ihi? Probably the form *bhīhi* in *mā bhīhi* 'fear not!' Mv ii.489.6 and 16 does not really belong here. (Senart has no note on it.) It can scarcely be from any present stem **bhī* plus ending *hi*; no such present stem exists in Skt. or MIndic. Rather it must be related to Pkt. (AMg., Ratnachandra; and M. JM., Pischel 501) *bīhai* 'fears' (acc. to Pischel from Skt. *bhīṣ*); the introduction, or reintroduction, of the aspirate *bh*, not recorded for this stem in Pkt., is doubtless due to analogical influence of forms of *bhī*. The ending is then not *hi*; *h* is part of the stem, and the ending is *i* (prob. aorist).

Other non-Sanskrit endings

30.11. 2 sg. ā. This occurs commonly but only in verse, and I believe only where meter requires a long final. Since any *a*, especially final, is freely treated thus, a few examples will suffice: *prakāśayā* SP 162.14; 192.10; *pravartayā* 163.4; 174.1; 191.9; *anumodayā* LV 42.11; *śruṇā* (to *śruṇati*) 94.12; *jayā* 94.17, 19; *gacchā* 114.22.

30.12. 1 pl. matha and 2 pl. tha (thā): see §§ 26.8–10, 12–14, 16.

30.13. 3 sg. and pl. (n)tū, only in verses m.c.: *spṛśatū* LV 235.19; *etū* LV 235.20; *pravartayantū* Suv 23.6; *vivarjayantū* Suv 24.3; *āsādayantū* Suv 41.14; so read the last three with the quotations in Śikṣ 216.15; 217.8; 219.3, respectively; Nobel's text prints °*ntu* with his mss.

30.14. 3 sg. to, in vss m.c. (§ 3.71): *bhāṣato* = °*tu*, 'let him speak', LV 7.11 (vs), supported in sense by Tib. bśad du gsol, '(we) ask (him) to explain'; *paripūryato* (for °*tu* = Skt. °*tāṃ*) *'sya āsā* (= *āśā*) *spṛśatū* (above) *varabodhim* LV 235.19, 'let his wish be fulfilled, let him reach enlightenment'.

30.15. 2 sg. su. This ending is common in Pkt.; Pischel's explanation (467; analogical to indicative *si*, like 3 sg. *tu* : *ti*) seems disproved by the fact that Pali regularly has *ssu*, and only m.c. *su* according to Geiger 126; it must therefore be derived with Geiger and others from the Skt. middle ending *sva*. (Its frequency in dialects which 'make little use of the middle' is of no weight; most MIndic dialects 'make little use of the middle'. And surely Pali *ssu* and Pkt. *su* must have a common origin.)

30.16. In our language, however, the ending scarcely exists. I know of only a single clear case: Mv ii.55.21 (vs), where read with one ms. *mā kāṅkṣiṣu*, 'don't hesitate' (proved by *mā vicārayi*, same meaning, in the same vs in Pali, Jāt. v.397.5). On *i* for *a* see § 27.10. Further, LV 322.20 (vs) reads in both edd. *prekṣasu nātha*, but this may be read *prekṣa sunātha*, cf. 322.16 *prekṣa kānta*, 323.2 *prekṣahi nātha*. And LV 328.9 (vs) is read by Lefmann *ramasu yuvatibhiḥ*, but perhaps Calc. is right in dividing *rama suyuvatibhiḥ*.

30.17. 1 pl. mahe (?). In SP 243.2 (prose) all Nep. mss. read *vandāmahe*, which KN em. to °*mahai*, as subj.-impv.; this is kept in WT without note; Kashgar rec. *vandema*, opt. But an indicative would be quite possible in the context, even in normal Skt.; 'we (will) revere.'

30.18. 2 pl. dhva. Instead of *dhvam* the ending *dhva* occurs in RP 18.14 (vs) *yujyadhva*, obviously m.c. for °*dhvam*. But the same ending seems to occur in prose in Divy 374.12 *mārgadhveti*, apparently for °*dhva* plus *iti* (or for °*dhve*, transferred from the indicative, plus *ti* for *iti*?).

30.19. 2 pl. dhve. The primary indicative ending *dhve* may be used instead of *dhvam* in the impv.: *abhiyujyadhve* (v.l. °*yatha*) SP 79.11 (prose).

30.20. 3 pl. ntān. This is merely an orthographic variant for *ntāṃ* = Skt. *ntām*; final *ṃ*, from *m*, is constantly interchanged with *n*. Ex.: *ramantān* (some mss. °*ntāt*, a mere graphic error, *t* written for *n*) LV 43.6 (vs, end of line).

31. Future

iṣya with thematic presents

31.1. The normal future in our dialect, indefinitely productive, is made by adding *iṣya* to thematic present stems (often MIndic) minus the thematic vowel. Examples are numerous in verses everywhere, and in the prose of Mv; in prose of other texts they occur sporadically. Our examples are from prose except those marked (vs). They will be arranged in alphabetic order of 'roots' (Sanskrit, so far as they exist there). Others will be found in the list of 1 sg. futures ending in *aṃ* (*a*), §§ 31.31–33.

āp: *paryāpuniṣyanti* Mv iii.52.18 (passive in mg., 'will be mastered').

iṣ: *pratīcchiṣyati* Mv ii.435.12.

kṛ (*kirati*): *prākiriṣyanti* (read *pra*°?) Mv iii.324.8; *vikiriṣyase* LV 335.7 (vs).

kṛṣ: *kṛṣiṣyanti* Divy 212.17.

krī: *krīṇiṣyati* (v.l. *krīṇī*°) Mv. ii.242.1.

kṣip: *kṣipiṣyati* LV 145.14 (vs; so read with most mss. for Lefm. *kṣap*°).

grah: *gṛhṇiṣyāmi* Mv ii.450.15 (to *gṛhṇati*).

ci: *praviciniṣyati* SP 372.7.

cyu: *cyaviṣyati* Mv i.196.21; 197.1, 7; 357.3; 366.9; *cyaviṣyasi* id. iii.404.5.

chid: *chindiṣyati* Mv ii.145.8; iii.403.18.

ji: *saṃnirjiniṣyāmi* Mv ii.270.11.

jñā: *jāniṣyati* Mv i.244.11; ii.437.1; 445.2.

dhā: *śraddadhiṣyanti* SP 313.5 (vs); Mv iii.89.17 (vs); *abhiśraddadhiṣyati* Mv iii.76.6; °*yanti* ibid. 9.

dhov(*ati*): *dhoviṣyati* Mv iii.312.17.

dhyā: *dhyāyiṣyase* LV 334.21 (vs).

pattīyati, *pratīyati* (Dict.): *pattīyiṣyanti* SP 286.8; 312.9; and according to Kashgar rec. 36.7; 37.10, where ed. with Nep. *pratīyiṣyanti*.

pad: *āpadyiṣyanti* Mv i.360.5; °*yatha* iii.290.9; *upapadyiṣyanti* i.361.10; °*yati* iii.42.20; °*yasi* iii.43.1; 404.5. Forms recorded as *-padiṣyati* etc. are mere corruptions. E. g. Mv i.50.15; 51.11 *upapadiṣyati* should be read (*buddho loke*) *upadṛśyati* 'appears' (with 1 ms. in 50.15, the rest *upapaddiśyati*) or *upadiśyati*, intending the same word (so most mss. in 51.11, one *upaddiśyati*) with MIndic *i* for *ṛ* = Pali *upadissati* (Skt. *upadṛś*); possibly read *-dd-* by analogy as in aorist *addṛśat* etc. The extra syllable *-pa-* in most mss. 50.15 is mere dittography. Again Mv iii.52.8 and 9 print *pratipadiṣyāmi* and *āpadiṣyāmi* (v.l. *āpayiṣyāmi*); but in the repetition line 14 it is perfectly clear that the mss. intend *pratipadyiṣyāmi* (one here omits the syllable *dyi* altogether; Senart wrongly °*padi*°) and *āpadyiṣyāmi* (so Senart with both mss.); these forms should be read in 8 and 9.

paś: *paśyiṣyāmaḥ* Mv ii.74.9, 10; 315.5; °*yatha* ii.445.13; iii.288.3; °*yasi* ii.446.2; 448.20; °*yāmi* ii.479.3.

pā: *pibiṣyati* Mv ii.242.11.

pṛcch: *pṛcchiṣyate* Suv 216.9 (vs).

buddh(*ati*): *vibuddhiṣyati* Mv ii.160.8; *buddhiṣyanti* ii.173.13; *abhisaṃbuddhiṣyasi* ii.400.14; etc.

bhañj: *bhaṃjiṣyāmi* Mv ii.280.4.

bhuj 'enjoy': *paribhuṃjiṣyāmaḥ* Mv i.325.6; °*yāmi* ii.65.16; iii.159.19; 180.9; °*yasi* ii.248.5; °*yati* iii.126.1; *bhuṃjiṣyati* ii.242.11; °*yāmaḥ* i.28.11.

man: *abhimanyiṣyati* Mv ii.440.17. In Mv i.239.15; 331.13; 333.15 Senart reads *maniṣyanti*. Altho Pischel 457 and Ratnach. record AMg. and M. *maṇāmi*, *maṇe* (1st class), to which this may be a future, I am doubtful about it. In i.331.13 the mss. have *śraddhātavyaṃ anyiṣyanti*, clearly intending *manyiṣyanti*; one ms. in 333.15 also reads *manyiṣyati*; in all three passages we have the same formula, and perhaps *manyi*° should be read in all.

mā, *mi*: *abhinirmiṇiṣyanti* (or °*niṣ*°) Mv iii.288.2, 3, 5, 9, 12; °*ṣyāmaḥ* iii.324.4.

muṣ: *muṣiṣyāmaḥ* Divy 94.5; 101.9.

mūṣ (= *muṣ*): *mūṣiṣyate* Divy 281.8.

mṛd: *mardiṣyāmi* Mv ii.270.4.

yaj: *yajiṣyati* Mv ii.98.7; °*ṣyāmi* ii.95.8, 9, 11; 98.6, 18.

ram: *ramiṣyati* Mv ii.443.10.

ric: *riñciṣyasi* Bbh 396.20; °*yati* AsP 190.1.

ru: *viraviṣyati* Divy 276.2.

ruh: *āruhiṣyati* Mv ii.90.12.

lī: *pratisaṃlayiṣyāmi* Mv iii.428.15.

(*vas*: *adhyāvasiṣyasi* Mv ii.159.2; but *vasiṣyati* E. in BR and Whitney, Roots).

vā: *vāyiṣyanti* Mv ii.308.8 (vs).

viś: *praviśiṣyati* Mv i.360.4; 361.8; *upaviśiṣyati* ii.439.15.

viṣ: *pariviṣiṣyāmaḥ* (mss. °*viś*°) Mv ii.275.12.

vṛdh: *abhivardhiṣyanti* Mv i.332.13; 333.4, 18.

śam: *praśamiṣyati* Mv i.289.4 (Skt. *śamiṣyati* Gram.).

śru: *śruṇiṣyati* LV 54.6 etc.; *pratiśruṇiṣyāmi* Mv ii.223.20 (vs); *śruṇiṣyatha* iii.297.11; °*yati* Samādh p. 68 line 18.

sad: *abhiprasīdiṣyati* Mv iii.424.12; *niṣīdiṣyāmo* iii.427.4.

sic: *abhiṣiṃciṣyanti* Mv ii.207.1.

sthā: *upasthihiṣyanti* Mv i.325.19, 20; °*yati* ii.428.8; °*yāmaḥ* iii.37.7.

spṛś: *spṛśiṣyasi* SP 294.10 (vs); *spṛsiṣyati* LV 288.10 (vs), and with semi-MIndic orthography *pṛsiṣyati* (dental *s*) 153.18 (vs); *spṛśiṣye* LV 287.4 (vs); Mv ii.404.2 (vs).

hā: *jahiṣyāmi* Mv iii.52.16; °*yasi* iii.406.15.

hu: *juhiṣyāmaḥ* Mv iii.161.11.

31.2. Present passive stems may form futures like any other thematic presents: *bādhyiṣyate* 'will be overcome' LV 366.2 (vs; with Tib. by em.); *dīyiṣyati* Mv i.356.14, 16, 'will be given'; *sthapīṣyati* (v.l. *sthāpayiṣyati*) Mv ii.69.14 (see § 37.6; read perhaps *sthapīyiṣyati*; certainly future to *sthapīyati*, passive of *sthapeti*); *paripacciṣyati* (for °*pacyi*°) Mv ii.311.8; *bhajjiṣyati* (for *bhajyi*°; but v.l. *bhaṃji*°) Mv ii.489.20 'will be broken'; *viruddhiṣyati* Mv ii.490.15, perhaps for *virudhyi*°? in any case to passive *virudhyate*, 'will be at odds (with you)'; *khajjiṣyatha* (for *khādyi*°; v.l. *khajjatha*) Mv iii.290.17; *khajjiṣyasi* Mv ii.78.4. And with *h* for *ṣy* (cf. §§ 31.19, 20), *kṣīyihanti* (mss. cited as *kṣīpihanti*, Senart *kṣipihanti*) Mv ii.53.14 (vs; to *kṣīyate*, Pali *khīyati*, 'will be lost'). Here probably belongs *vikrāyiṣyati*, which I would read in Mv ii.242.14 for Senart *vikrayiṣyati*, v.l. *vikrāmāṣyati* (!); and cf. fut. *vikrāsyati* 242.11 (see below; v.l. *vikrāmasyati*); both from **vikrāyate* 'is sold', a MIndic passive to *vi-krī* (§ 37.39).

Future sign affixed to stems in long vowels

31.3. But also the *ya* of the passive, after a long vowel (*ī*, *ā*), is sometimes lost: *dīṣyati* 'will be given' Mv i.349.18; 350.1; ii.467.8; 468.11; 469.13, 17; 471.9; 472.18; 474.13; 476.14 (cf. *dīyiṣyati* above); *nīṣyati* 'will be taken' Mv ii.110.1 (for **nīyiṣyati*, to *nīyate*); possibly *sthapīṣyati*, § 31.2; *prajāsyanti* (v.l. °*te*) LV 398.6 (prose; *jāsyati* in Skt. Epic, Whitney, Roots) and probably *jāsyante* 'will be born' LV 371.22 (vs, text *jñāsyante*, vv.ll. *jāyate* and *jāsyante*, see Foucaux Notes 193, supported by Tib.; cf. AMg. present *jāi* for *jāai* = *jāyate*, and future *-yāhisi* for *-jāsyase*, etc., Pischel 487, 527 end). That my analysis of *dīṣyati*, *nīṣyati* is correct seems proved by *tarīhasi* 'you will be taken across' Mv iii.328.8, 9, with *h* for *ṣy* as in *kṣīyihanti* § 31.2, from *tarīyati*, MIndic passive to *tarati* 'takes across', with loss of syllable *ya*; in this case no other interpretation seems possible. Also *vikrāsyati* (§ 31.2) may belong to **vikrāyate*, with loss of *ya*; but if the active was **vikrāti* 'sells', this might be for *vikrāsyate*, which could have passive as well as middle function, and be derived from the quasi-root *vi-krā*. On *svādhyāsyati* (: *svādhyāyati*) see §§ 28.54; 38.31.

31.4. Similarly from the MIndic present *allīyati* (Dict.), apparently not a passive, occurs a fut. *allīṣyatha* Mv ii.253.5, 7 (in 7 v.l. *allīyiṣyatha*). And so *patīṣyanti* Mmk 73.15 (prose) 'they will believe', certainly not passive, to **patīyati* = *pattīyati*.

31.5. Such futures from *ya*-presents, in which the omission of *ya* brings the future tense-sign into juxtaposition with a long vowel, belong in a single formal category with a group of futures which are mostly based on present stems in long vowels, to which *sya* (*ṣya*) is added. The distinction between *sya* (*ṣya*) and *iṣya* is, then, similar to that between *s*-aorists (after stems in long vowels) and *iṣ*-aorists (added to thematic presents, §§ 32.14, 47).

31.6. Instead of *sy* (*ṣy*), we sometimes find *h*, usually followed by *i* (for Skt. *ya*) instead of *a*, after long vowel (cf. § 31.19; Pischel 520 calls *h* for *s*(*s*) 'ein Lautübergang, der von den auf lange Vocale und Diphthongen endigenden Wurzeln und Stämmen ausgegangen ist'). As to forms with single *s*, presupposed by this *h*, see §§ 31.26 ff. When this *h* is found after short vowels (§ 31.20) it is due to analogical extension.

31.7. Here belong the MIndic futures to roots *bhū* and *kṛ*, §§ 31.12–18. Also, to the Skt. and Pali present *adhīte* 'reads, studies' we have the future *adhīṣyati* Mv ii.77.14. From the weak 9th class present stem *gṛhṇī-*, futures are fairly common: *gṛhṇīṣyati* Mv ii.242.2; 435.2; *gṛhṇīṣyāmi* ii.450.3, and *pari-g*° ii.126.6; 128.15; 129.17; *ni-g*° ii.127.10; *prati-g*° iii.304.16; *gṛhṇīṣyaṃ*, (1 sg., § 31.31) ii.474.15; °*ṣyāmaḥ* ii.449.17; 450.1. (Contrast *gṛhṇiṣyāmi*, § 31.1, based on thematic (MIndic) *gṛhṇati*.) Similarly *krīṇīṣyati*, if this v.l. on Mv ii.242.1 is the true form.

31.8. To the strong reduplicated stem *dadhā*: *abhiśraddadhāsyati* Divy 7.29; °*sye* 8.1 (others, Chap. 43, s.v. *dhā* 1). With this cf. other bases in *ā*, § 31.3, *vikrāsyati* (to *vikrāyate*) and (*pra*)*jāsyante*.

31.9. To presents in *-eti*, similarly, may be formed futures in *-eṣyati*. These sometimes are Skt. inheritances (and therefore not included in my work), like *neṣyati* to *neti* (Skt. *nayati*); or direct phonetic developments from Skt. futures, like *bheṣyati* (§ 31.12) from *bhaviṣyati*. They may be based on MIndic causatives or denominatives, like *utthapeṣyati* Mv iii.3.16, to *sthapayati*, *sthapeti*; or on other MIndic stems in *-e-* (or *-aya-*), like *uttheṣya-*(1 sg.) LV 368.10, *uttheṣyaṃ* (1 sg.; so with v.l., metr. also better, for monstrous *utthehiṣyaṃ* of text) Mv iii.83.15, to *-(s)theti*; *saṃvidheṣyanti* Mv i.354.12, to *-dheti*; *-leṣyate* AsP 139.17, 18, °*yante* 209.3, probably to **-layati* (**-leti*; but Skt. Gr. *leṣyati*); *vaheṣyaṃ* (1 sg.) Mv ii.236.13, to BHS *vaheti* = *vahati*.

31.10. From the root *grah*, the regular Skt. future is *grahīṣyati*; the Epic records *gṛhīṣyati* which occurs also here (e. g. *nigṛhīṣyase* LV 333.15; 334.1, both vss; *pratigṛhīṣyāmi* LV 384.3, prose, all mss.). But *graheṣyāmi* Mv iii.191.17, if correct (v.l. *gṛhīṣyāmi*; prose), would be based on the pres. **graheti*, of which abundant evidence is found in other verbal categories (Chap. 43). So also *udgraheṣyanti* in the Kashgar rec. of Vaj., Pargiter ap. Hoernle MR 186.8, 22 (here °*yati*); 187.9 (Müller's ed. based on Sanskritized mss. °*hīṣ*° 33.17; 34.14; 35.5).

31.11. Other forms of this type will be found under 1 sg. in *am* (*a*), § 31.31; any present in *aya*, or its MIndic equivalent *e*, is capable of forming a future stem in *-eṣya-*. But such verbs also often show futures in *-iṣya-*, which (tho the *i* might perhaps be regarded as a MIndic change from *e*, § 3.49) I have treated as cases of omission of *-ay-* (or *-a-* for *-aya-*), § 38.31.

31.12. The root *bhū* in Pali most commonly keeps the Skt. future as *bhavissati*, but in addition has both *hessati* and *-bhossati*, *-hossati*, *hohiti* (Geiger 151.3, end, 154.2). In Prakrit (Pischel 521) *hossai* (also *bhavissai*) and *hohii* etc. are found, but apparently no form with *e* in the root syllable. Our language of course often has the regular *bhaviṣyati*, which in this case (in view of the Pali and Pkt. conditions) may be in large part ancient, and not due to late Sanskritization. Otherwise the only common and more or less regular form is *bheṣyati* = Pali *hessati*. Much rarer, and in fact less than certain, is *bhoṣyati* = Pali *hossati*, Pkt. *hossai*. There are also, as in both Pali and Pkt., forms in *hoh-*, usually followed by stem final *i*, which I believe represents Skt. *-ya-*, so that *ho-h-i-* is derived from *ho-s-ya-*, with *h* resulting from intervocalic *s* after change of *ya* to *i*. There is an isolated form from a stem *-bhūṣya-*, perhaps denominative. All of these fall into the pattern of this group, *ṣya* being preceded by a long vowel. In a few cases (Śikṣ 45.12; 46.16; 47.9) *s* in *bhesy-* is written for *ṣ*, cf. in the same vicinity *bhavisyāmo* 46.18; this is probably a merely orthographic matter, of no linguistic importance. All the following are from verses. I have not noted any occurrence of any such form in prose, even that of Mv.

31.13. *bheṣyati* SP 68.1, 10; LV 48.13; 111.8; Mv i.234.5, 11; 251.18; 277.14 = 280.2 = 281.21; ii.87.2; iii.106.10, 11; 386.1; Samādh 8.24; 22.36; Suv 24.12; 44.14; 54.13; Dbh.g. 49(75).26; *bheṣyatī* (*ī* m.c.) LV 54.5; *bheṣyate* (perhaps sometimes *e* m.c.) LV 54.12; 73.16; 210.5; *bheṣyasi* LV 237.16; Mv i.243.1, and read so i.43.13 (same vs) for unmetrical *bhaviṣyasi* of mss. (Senart *hohisi*, em.); ii.92.20; 143.2; *bheṣyase* LV 195.16; 283.2; *bheṣyi* (1 sg. = *bhaviṣye*) SP 64.6; LV 92.21; Mv i.234.6; *anubheṣyāmi* Mv ii.87.7; *bheṣyaṃ* (1 sg.) Mv i.233.18; *bheṣyanti* SP 273.14; 274.5; Mv i.251.20, 21; ii.324.1; iii.278.20; Gv 214.5; Sukh 73.15; spelled *bhesyanti* Śikṣ 45.12; 47.9; in Laṅk 5.9 text *bhaviṣyanti* but meter seems to require *bheṣyanti*; *bheṣyāmas* or (m.c.) °*ma* SP 147.14; 223.1; spelled *bhesyāmo* Śikṣ 46.16; *bheṣyathā* RP 59.12.

31.14. *bhoṣyanti* SP 330.9 (both edd., no v.l.[1]); *bhoṣyi* (1 sg. = *bhaviṣye*) SP 291.13 (no v.l. in KN; but WT *bheṣyi* with their ms. K'). Since *bhoṣy-* is not recorded elsewhere, perhaps it should not be recognized in our dialect, despite the frequency of presents like *bhoti*.

31.15. *pratibhūṣyaṃ* (1 sg., § 31.30) 'I will warrant' Mv ii.142.17. Cf. the aorist *abhūṣī*(*t*), *abhūṣi*? But perhaps *ū* is due directly to influence of the noun *pratibhū* 'surety, security', which was surely commoner than the verb. The

1. But K' *bheṣyanti*, as Mrs. Ralph Ehret kindly informs me from a photograph of that ms.

form may even be classed as a kind of denominative. No corresponding future is noted in Pali or Pkt. (which also lack correspondents to the aorist *abhūṣi*, very common here).

31.16. *bhohī* LV 196.4 is 2 sg., 'thou shalt be'; but probably historically 3 sg. = Pkt. *hohī* (for *hohii*, Pischel 521).

Similarly *hohī ti* (= *iti*) is probably to be read with some mss. (v.l. *hohi ti*) Mv i.44.3 (2 sg., Senart em. *hohisi*).

hohiti (= Pali id., Pkt. *hohii*), sometimes with v.l. *hohīti*, occurs Mv i.208.5 = ii.12.14; ii.13.3; 40.20 (twice); *hohisi*, 2 sg., Mv i.337.9 (v.l. *hohiti*); in Mv ii.206.13 mss. *hohiti* or *hohīti*, 3 pl., Senart em. *hohinti*; meter requires long penult, but perhaps read *hohīti* (which also occurs as v.l. for *hohiti*).

31.17. Thematic *a* instead of penultimate *i* appears in such forms (cf. Pkt. *hohāmi*, *hohāmo*, but apparently not *hoha[t]i*, *hohanti*, Pischel 521): *hohati* Mv ii.225.5; 405.12 (mss., Senart wrongly em. *hohisi*; 3 sg. 'one shall become', not 2 sg.); *hohanti* Mv ii.224.21 (v.l. *hohati*).

31.18. Here belong also the MIndic futures from *kṛ* which correspond to the Pali and Pkt. forms recorded in Geiger 153, Pischel 533 (types *kāhiti* and *kāhati*, like *hohiti* and *hohati*, above). They look as if based immediately on MIndic **kāsiti* (in which I consider the penultimate *i* to represent Skt. *ya*; otherwise Geiger 19.1) and *kāsati* (1 sg. *kāsaṃ* Geiger 153), generally supposed to represent Skt. **karṣyati* (Pali also has *kassāmi*, *kassaṃ*, Geiger l. c.). In such forms *-*rṣ*- could have yielded *ss*, then single *s* with lengthened vowel. In our language all the following occur only in verses; at least I have failed to record any in prose, even of the Mv. We find 3 sg. *kāhiti* Mv ii.41.20; 42.1, 3; iii.289.7; Samādh p. 67 line 25; also *kāhitī* with *ī* m.c. Śikṣ 101.6 (wrongly em. in ed. to °*ti*); and *kāhi* SP 154.8 (m.c. for Pkt. **kāhī* = *kāhii* for *kāhiti*, cf. Pischel 520; but WT *kāhiti* with v.l.); 2 sg. *kāhisi* Mv ii.238.9, 12; 3 pl. *kāhinti* Mv i.256.6; ii.323.21; 353.21; 354.8 (= iii.278.12), 10, 18, 20; 355.5, 13, 19; 484.2; Samādh p. 53 line 27; with thematic *a*, 1 pl. *kāhāma* Mv ii.229.15.

Futures containing *h* in lieu of *sy* (*ṣy*)

31.19. As was noted above, § 31.6, this phonetic change certainly started after stems in long vowels (Skt. or MIndic). We have listed the forms of roots *bhū* (§§ 31.16, 17) and *kṛ* (§ 31.18); also the isolated *tarīhasi*, fut. to pass. *tarīyati* (§ 31.3).

31.20. However, this formation spread by analogy to other stems, as also in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 150, end; Pischel 520). We have mentioned *kṣīyihanti* (§ 31.2). Here the following other cases may be noted; they are rare and troublesome. The clearest is Mmk 577.16 (vs) *ahaṃ ca bhāṣahe hy atra parṣanmadhye sudāruṇam*. Here the meter is perfect, and it seems clear that *bhāṣahe* = *bhāṣiṣye*, 'I shall speak'. In Mv iii.355.14 (vs, meter imperfect) *sā* (sc. *bodhisattvaśya mahākaruṇā*) *'sya bhajahe cittasaṃtā-naṃ*, if the text be accepted, seems to mean 'it will take possession of his mentality'; *bhajahe* would then function as 3 sg. future (but with ending of 1 sg. middle, as if = *bhajiṣye*). The only other case I know is even more doubtful: *saṃpranadahe* LV 338.19 (vs), apparently 1 sg., 'I shall cry out, shout' (represented by Tib. sun ḥbyin?); but the text is highly questionable, see note in Lefmann's Crit. App. The thematic vowel -*a*- in such forms must presumably be analogical to historic presents.

First singular forms in *eham* (?)

31.21. Senart Mv i note p. 403 cites a few forms in *ehaṃ* which he takes as 1 sg. optative, regarding *h* as a substitute for *y* (that is, *ehaṃ* as a substitute for *eyaṃ*), and stating that similar forms are found in Aśokan dialects. On the Aśokan forms see now Hultzsch's ed., *ye(haṃ)* lxxxii, xcix; *ālabhehaṃ*, *yehaṃ*, *(pa)ṭi(pāday)ehaṃ*, *paṭi-pātayehaṃ* cix; *abhyuṃnāmayehaṃ* cxxi. Senart l.c. lists from Mv three cases ('et quelques autres'), of which i.243.16 *gaccheham* must be dismissed (the passage is corrupt and violently emended by Senart; there is a v.l. *gaccheha*, and if *gacchehaṃ* is right it can be understood as *gacche 'ham*). I shall first list all the cases I have found which could conceivably be concerned; general discussion will follow, but I note here that in every case futures would do as well as optatives, as far as the sense is concerned; and the same is true of all the Aśokan forms.

yaṃ nūnāhaṃ kalpānāṃ śatasahasraṃ tiṣṭhehaṃ Mv i.51.7–8 (prose), 'suppose I should (shall) remain for 100,000 kalpas'. But half of the mss. read *tiṣṭheyaṃ*; -*haṃ* may be a mere text corruption. If it is correct it could be future, which (instead of the commoner optative) may be used after *yan nūna*, cf. Childers p. 603, 2d column, *yan nūnāhaṃ tassa santike dhammaṃ sunissāmi*.

tasmiṃ samaye aham anuttarāṃ samyaksaṃbodhim abhisaṃbudhyehaṃ Mv i.61.5 (prose), text. But five of Senart's six mss., including the two best, read *arhan* or *arham* instead of (the first) *aham*. I should read *(a)rhan(n)*, and understand *abhisaṃbudhye 'haṃ*; the nom. sg. *arhan* goes easily in agreement with the subject.

samayato te pañca utpalāni dadehaṃ (mss. *dahehaṃ*) Mv i.233.7 (prose). Read probably *dade* (1 sg. pres. mid.) *'haṃ*; there is otherwise no 1 sg. pronoun in the sentence.

nāhaṃ tasya dhītāṃ (mss. *dhītā*) *dadyehaṃ* Mv ii.73.16–17 (prose), 'I will not give him my daughter'. This form is puzzling in other respects than the ending; I know of no optative from this verb in -*ye*- (blend of *dadyām* and *dadeyaṃ*?); there is no v.l., but it is probably a corruption.

yan nūnāhaṃ . . . āpadyehaṃ Mv ii.120.16 (prose). Cf. i.51.7–8 above; but here no v.l.

sa khalv ahaṃ bhikṣavaḥ sādhu ca suṣṭhu ca abhisaṃ-skāreṇa ucchretvā pāṃśukṛtāni gātrāṇi pāṇinā parimārjehaṃ Mv ii.126.7–8 (prose). No v.l. here, but the same phrase (with slight variants) is repeated thrice later, and each time (127.12; 128.17; 130.2) *parimārjeyaṃ* is read without v.l. (except in 130.2 one ms. °*jayaṃ*). Perhaps read *pari-mārjeyaṃ* also in 126.8.

sa khalv ahaṃ bhikṣavo mudgayūṣaṃ (so v.l.) *vikṛtaṃ* (or *pi kṛtaṃ* with v.l.?) *bhuṃjehaṃ* Mv ii.131.8–9 (prose). Here, to be sure, the preceding clause contains an opt., *āhareyaṃ*; but a future is equally possible.

yaṃ nūnam asya ito haṃ udumbaraphalāni dadehaṃ Mv ii.246.10–11 (prose). Cf. i.51.7–8 above; but here no v.l.

anupravrajyehaṃ Mv iii.50.16 (prose) mss., Senart em. °*vrajehaṃ*, cf. ii.73.16–17 above, *dadyehaṃ*. At the end of a very long sentence, at the beginning of which (in line 12) occurs the pronoun *ahaṃ*. The intervening distance is so great that it is very easy to suppose the author had forgotten the first *aham*, and duplicated it in 16; read then *anupravrajye* (or °*je*?) *'haṃ*.

31.22. Discussion. All these forms could be read as containing the pronoun *(a)ham*, after a verb ending in -*e* (opt., aorist, or pres. mid.), if the reading is otherwise correct (note that in several cases it is very doubtful). True, in some of them this would duplicate a previous occurrence of *aham* (in some, however, such as the last case, at such a great distance that this unevenness is easily comprehensible). Such a duplication is otherwise perhaps not unprecedented; cf. Mv i.51.14–15, where Senart assumes a pleonastic *aham* after a 1 sg. pres.: *yaṃ nūnāhaṃ kalpānāṃ śatasahasraṃ sthātum icchāmy ahaṃ*. Note that this is a close parallel to, and shortly follows, i.51.7–8 above where Senart assumes *tiṣṭhehaṃ* as 'optative'. If *aham* may be duplicated in lines 14–15, surely it may be duplicated in lines 7–8 of the same page. (I am, to be sure, not certain of Senart's text in 14–15; he inserts *icchatha* after *icchāmy*

ahaṃ, without ms. authority; perhaps this *ahaṃ* originally belonged to the following clause, corrupt in the mss.)

In most, perhaps in all, the Aśokan forms cited above, *(a)haṃ* as a pronoun, following a verb form in *-e*, could easily be assumed.

If, however, *-ehaṃ* is really the ending of a verb form, here and in the Aśokan inscriptions, I doubt whether Senart and Hultzsch are right in taking it as an optative. Senart's assumption of a phonetic change of *y* to *h* seems implausible. I should prefer to regard such forms (if they are real) as futures in *-haṃ* (with *-aṃ* instead of *-āmi*, § 31.30), based on present stems in *-e-* instead of *-a-* (§ 38.2, 21), and with *h* instead of *s(y)*, §§ 31.6, 19. Cf. Pischel 528 *vattehāmi* (from an *-aya* verb, 10th class), and 520 *hasehāmi*, from Skt. *hasati*; **hasehaṃ* would be a precise parallel to the (supposed) forms here under consideration.[2]

Futures in *sya* (*ṣya*) after consonants, more or less un-Sanskritic

31.23. Mention should be made of some miscellaneous futures in *sya* (*ṣya*) after consonants which are not recorded in standard Skt. literature, tho some of them are formed regularly enough and some are authorized by grammarians (Gr.) or occur in the Skt. epic.

Root *kruś* (*krokṣyati* Gr.): *ākrokṣyanti* Divy 38.11, 14 (prose); *pratikrokṣyanti* AsP 179.4 (prose).

kṛṣ (*krakṣya-* B.S.; *karkṣyati* Gr.): *ākṛkṣyata* ms., *ākarkṣyataḥ* (3 dual) ed. em., MSV ii.65.20 (prose).

nah (*natsyati* Gr.): *saṃnatsyāmi* Śikṣ 283.4 (prose).

lup (*lopsyati*, °*te* Gr.): *vilopsyase* LV 334.11.

stambh: *avaṣṭapsyate* (nowhere recorded) Divy 574.18; 575.7.

han (*haṃsyati* Epic, Whitney Roots): *hansye* LV 311.18 (vs).—On *abhigaṃsye*, 1 sg. fut. to *abhi-gam*, see § 31.29, end.

31.24. In LV 335.1 (vs), instead of Lefm. *vibhartsyase* (against all his mss.), a future is surely intended as in all parallel verbs in the passage, and the best mss. read *vihatsyase*, 'you shall be frustrated', as fut. of *vi-han*, which is very appropriate in meaning. I take this for **-hantsyase*, corresponding to the Pali fut. *hañchati* (Geiger 153.2; also *-haṅkhati* and 1 sg. *-haññi*). On the *-t-* cf. Whitney 207; and for *-ts-* instead of *-ns-* (through the medium of *-nts*?) cf. *(e)tsu(ḥ)* as 3 pl. ending for *(e)nsu(ḥ)*, § 32.97; Bloch, Indo-Aryen 88. The *ts* may, of course, be a Sanskritization (back-formation) from MIndic *ch*.

31.25. More irregular and doubtful: *etsye* Mv i.257.18 (prose), and by em. 257.11; seems to be a 3 or 1 sg. future of root *i*, for *eṣyate* or *eṣye*. Perhaps corrupt; see Senart's note. — *dṛkṣye* RP 46.10 (vs), for *drakṣye* (*dṛś*); corruption? — *mṛkṣyanti*, or probably rather *āmṛkṣyanti* Śikṣ 45.12 (vs; preceded by *citrā*; preverb *ā* probably intended), 'will enjoy', fut. of Skt. (*ā-*)*mṛś*, cf. Pali *āmasati*. No fut. of *mṛś* recorded in literature; *markṣyati* and *mrakṣyati* Gr. — *anuśākṣyati* Suv 81.6 (prose), Nobel's em., mss. *anuśāsiṣyate* or *upaśākṣate*. If correct, perhaps blend of *-śāsiṣyati* and *-śikṣati*; cf. Pali *anusikkhāmi*, s.v. *anusikkhati* (b), 'perhaps taken for a fut. of *anu* plus root *śās*', CPD.

Futures with *s* for *sy*

31.26. We have seen that the MIndic forms with *hi* (analogically sometimes *ha*) for *sya* (§ 31.12) imply MIndic reduction of *ya* to *i*, leaving single *s* (after a long vowel). Some such forms with single *s* are actually recorded in Pali and Pkt. (e. g. Pali *kāsaṃ*, Geiger 153). And in Ap. (Jacobi, Bhav. 41*, San. 17) futures in *s*, instead of *ss*, are common, and the *s* is not exclusively added to long vowels. In our language however they are rare, except for the single stem *gaṃsa-* (to *gam*) in Mv.

31.27. The only instance noted after a long vowel is *prahāsate* Ud xix.1, in the oldest ms. (rewritten in later mss.), fut. of *pra-hā*, = *prahāsyate*. On the dubious and obscure *ākhyāsi* of Mv iii.451.6, see § 32.123.

31.28. After the 'union-vowel' *i*: *śikṣiṣenti* Gv 481.1 (vs), seemingly for *śikṣiṣyanti* which is metrically impossible (*e* from *ya*? § 3.116); perhaps *parirakṣisanto* LV 47.10 (vs; °*ṣyanto* would spoil the meter; barely possible might be *parirakṣi*, ger., 'guarding', followed by *santo* nom. pl. of *sant*). Further, in a number of verses of LV and RP, forms in *-iṣya-* occur where the meter seems to demand a short syllable, suggesting that the true reading may be *-iṣa-*: *bhaviṣyatha* LV 231.20; *bhāviṣyanti* 232.5 (*ā* in first syllable m.c., § 3.11); *vartiṣyante* 232.6; *bhaviṣyasi* 288.2, 6; *spṛsiṣyati* 288.10; *antarahāpayiṣyanti* RP 17.15; *bhramiṣyanti* 17.17.

31.29. After consonants: *pratilapssase* (so text!) Gv 286.4 (vs), but this, tho not corrected in 2d ed., is probably a misprint for *pratilapsyase* (to *labh*); and *pratinisrakṣati*, v.l. for °*kṣyati* Mvy 5232, is probably to be rejected. (See however § 2.23 for better authenticated instances of futures in *-kṣa-* for Skt. *-kṣya-*.) There are no other clear cases of futures in *-s-* after consonants except *gaṃsati* and its type, from *gam*, fairly common in Mv (not noted elsewhere), mostly in verses but twice in prose: *gaṃsati* (*gansati*) iii.85.16; 88.1, 9; *gaṃsāmi* ii.86.5, 18; 87.7; 240.15; 406.10; iii.15.19; 86.14; 168.8 (prose); 187.5; *gaṃse*, 1 sg. mid., iii.415.11 (prose, v.l. *gāme*); *anugaṃsaṃ*, 1 sg., iii.270.10 (so Senart em., mss. *anugaṃsemi*, metrically impossible); *gansi*, v.l. *gaṃsi*, iii.45.10, seems to be 2 sg., m.c. for *ganse*, cf. *-sye*, *-syi* as 2 sg., § 31.35 (*paralokaṃ gato santo narakaṃ gansi pārthiva*, 'being gone to the other world, you shall go to hell, O prince'); *gaṃsatha*, 2 pl., iii.86.1. Once *-gaṃsye* occurs as 1 sg.: *abhigaṃsye* ii.144.3. On possibly related MIndic forms see Bloch, Indo-Aryen 88 (after H. Smith).

First singular futures in *aṃ* (*a*)

31.30. Both Pali and Pkt. have well authenticated 1 sg. futures in *aṃ* (apparently the secondary ending used as primary), by the side of the regular *āmi* (Geiger 150, Pischel 520). This *aṃ* is very common in Mv, and occurs sporadically elsewhere. Instead of *aṃ* we also find *a*, not recorded in Geiger or Pischel; but chiefly in verses where meter requires a short final; the few exceptions may possibly be corruptions. On the doubtful forms in *ehaṃ* see above, §§ 31.21, 22.

31.31. We shall first list separately examples of forms in *eṣyam* from presents in *aya* or its MIndic equivalent *e* (§ 31.11); all are from prose except those marked (vs): *deśeṣyam* SP 336.12 (vs); *saṃjaneṣyaṃ* Mv i.145.12 (vs); *pratipūreṣyaṃ* 145.18 (vs; so mss., Senart em. *pra-pūr*°, m.c.); *kalpeṣyaṃ* 346.9, 16 (but 347.4 *kalpayiṣyaṃ*); *ānāpeṣyaṃ* (Pali *ānāpeti*, caus. of *ā-nī*) ii.103.5; *ucchreṣyaṃ* 126.6; 127.10; 128.15; 130.1 (to *ucchrayate* 'arise'); *moceṣyam* 183.7 (vs); *tāreṣyaṃ* 204.7 (vs); *vaheṣyaṃ* 236.13

---

2. Bloch, MSL 23.115, regards the Aśokan and Mv forms as 'une soudure du verbe [opt.] avec le pronom [*ahaṃ*] postposé.' Further: 'M. Helmer Smith me signale que dans les textes présentés à la première personne . . . le pali va jusqu'à postposer *ahaṃ* à des verbes déjà précédés du même pronom' (cf. several Mv cases, above). See further H. Smith, BSL 33.169 ff.; he would (170) plausibly read *vaheham* (Senart *vahed ahaṃ*, unmetr.) in Mv ii.194.2 = Pali Vv. 81.19 *vahissaṃ* (so comm., text *vāh*°), future! However, *vahe* (1 sg. mid.) *'haṃ* may easily be understood in Mv.

(to pres. *vaheti*, for *vahati*, § 38.21); *neṣyaṃ* 248.4; *māreṣyaṃ* 428.19.

31.32. Others (prose except those marked vs): *udīrayiṣyaṃ* Mv i.1.15; 2.4; *praveksyam* 157.13 (vs); *bhaviṣyaṃ* 362.17; 364.20; ii.480.7 etc.; *samādāpayiṣyaṃ* i.321.20; *kārāpayiṣyaṃ* 325.17; *jīviṣyaṃ* 362.8; *visarjayiṣyaṃ* 363.1; *drakṣyaṃ* ii.41.7, 11 (vss); *śroṣyaṃ* 41.9 (vs); *adhyeṣiṣyaṃ* 108.5; *niṣkramiṣyaṃ* 141.4; *abhiṣiṃciṣyaṃ* 158.3; *chindiṣyaṃ* (pass., 'I shall be cut') 173.14; *gamiṣyaṃ* 173.17; 460.17; *anukṣamāpayiṣyaṃ* 213.16; *paricariṣyaṃ* 214.11; *abhisaṃbudhiṣyaṃ* 265.6 (read °*buddhi*° or °*budhyi*°?); °*budhyi*°, v.l. °*buddhi*° 403.19; *labhiṣyaṃ* 274.7, *sajjiṣyaṃ* 8, *kariṣyaṃ*, *māpayiṣyaṃ* 13, *kārayiṣyaṃ* 14; *lapsyaṃ* 327.16 (vs); *pariveśāpayiṣyaṃ* 435.11 (= °*veṣ*°, 'wait upon'); *utkhanāpayiṣyaṃ* 437.13; *mārayiṣyaṃ* 459.16; *vasiṣyaṃ* 463.2; 478.7 (in the latter mss. *osiṣyaṃ*, Senart *āsiṣyaṃ*); *pradāsyaṃ* 486.16; *upadarśayiṣyaṃ* iii.43.1; *vihariṣyaṃ* 52.1; 53.3; *ānāpayiṣyaṃ* 125.17 (cf. *ānāpeṣyaṃ* ii.103.5, § 31.31); *pravrajiṣyaṃ* 218.3, 16; *niṣīdiṣyaṃ* 225.11; *ācikṣiṣyaṃ* 258.13 ff. (7 times); *anveṣyaṃ* 262.18; 265.6; *prativiramiṣyaṃ* 268.11 ff.; *pratiṣṭhāpayiṣyaṃ* 403.1; *upasthāsyaṃ* Śikṣ 154.17; *dhoviṣyaṃ* 154.19 (both prose, from Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka, prose of which is like that of Mv).

31.33. Ending *a*, instead of *am*, mostly m.c.; cases where meter does not require short final are possibly corrupt and are specially noted: *kariṣya* LV 178.4; *sthapeṣya* 178.20; *bhaviṣya* 324.2; 326.17; in 327.5, read *ramiṣya* with most mss., text °*ṣyi*; in 327.15, read *bhāvayiṣya* with best ms., others °*ṣye* (unmetr.); Lefm. °*ṣyi*; *uttheṣya* 368.10 (to *uttheti*, § 28.48); *pravartayiṣya* 393.14; in 402.16, read *vartiṣya* with most mss.—In Mv i.143.10, read *upeṣya* (to *upeti* = Skt. *upaiti*) with all mss. (Senart *upetya*; in parallel 200.6 read the same, Senart em. *upeṣyi*); *kṣapayiṣya* ii.91.10; *abhisaṃbuddheṣya* 404.19 (prose!; Senart em. °*ṣyaṃ*; one ms. °*ya*, the other °*yo*; *-e-* before *ṣya* is also strange, we expect °*buddhiṣyaṃ*, cf. under Mv ii.265.6, § 31.32; but cf. §§ 38.2, 21). — *praveksya haṃ* Suv 62.1, *tarpiṣya haṃ* 2 (so divide; *haṃ* = *ahaṃ*; meter guarantees *a*, rather than *e* or *aṃ*). — *vibhajiṣya* RP 53.16. — *prāpiṣya* (for *prāpayiṣyāmi*) Dbh.g 12(348).11. — *pūjayiṣya* Sukh 8.12; *muñcayiṣya* 8.16; *ārabhiṣya* 8.17 (vs, but end of line, not m.c.; text with mss. *ārabhidhya*, taken by Müller p. xvi as gerund, certainly wrongly; read either *ārabhiṣya* or °*ṣyaṃ*).

31.34. Twice in RP occur forms in *iṣya* which seem clearly used as 3 sg. or pl.; both in verses, meter requiring short final: *mociṣya* 15.8; *bhaviṣya* 29.12. Should they be regarded as historically 1 sg. forms used as 3 sg. or pl. (§ 25.27)? (Cf. the forms in *iṣye* used as 2 sg., § 31.35.) Or are they based on 3 person forms, originally with secondary endings (like the 1 sg. in *syam*), with final *a* m.c. for *at*, *an*?

Second singular futures in *sye*, *iṣye* (*iṣyi*)

31.35. In Mv iii.454.6 = 457.4 (vs) *prapatiṣye* seems certainly a 2 sg. future. Senart, note on 451.6, p. 527, calls it a future 'with optative ending'. More likely it is simply a 1 sg. (mid.) form used as 2 sg.; cf. *gansi* Mv iii.45.10 used as 2 sg. (§ 31.29) and the common use of 3 sg. (sometimes 3 pl., and more rarely 1 sg., § 25.27) forms in the place of other persons and numbers. Whatever the explanation may be, similar forms certainly occur elsewhere: *soṣiṣye* (= *śo*°) . . . *apāyān* (ed. *apāyāt*) LV 164.8 (vs) 'you shall destroy'; *sthāpayiṣye* 178.12 (vs) and id. 16 (here Lefm. em. *thāp*°; his ms. A *thāpayiṣyasi*); *dāsye* 179.2 (vs); *kṣipraṃ bhesye prītiprāmodyalābhī* 196.10 (vs) 'quickly you shall become an attainer of joy and gladness'. In Gv 58.2 (vs) *spṛśiṣyi* is also certainly 2 sg., 'you shall touch, attain', presumably m.c. for *spṛśiṣye* (tho further change seems needed to make the line metrically correct). [According to Foucaux's translation, LV 222.13 *śruṇiṣyi* and 16 *ghrāyiṣyi* would also be 2 sg. fut.; but I consider them 1 sg. Foucaux translates the Tib. version of *śruṇiṣyi* as 2 sg., but of *ghrāyiṣyi* as 1 sg.; the Tib. text does not support a 2 sg. in either case.]

Periphrastic future

31.36. Sen (55) says that the periphrastic future does not occur in 'Buddhistic Sanskrit proper' (but only in the Buddhacarita). This is an exaggeration. To be sure it is rare, and shows little of interest; such irregularities as are found are mostly duplicated among the 'epic and late' forms noted by Whitney 944b, which see on most of the following. A quite regular and normal form is *kartāsmi* . . . *pramokṣaṃ* LV 231.12 (vs). First and second person forms without the copula, but with personal pronouns: *bhavitāhaṃ* (= *bhavitāsmi*) LV 324.6 (vs); *tvaṃ* . . . *anutthātā bodhimaṇḍā(t)* LV 332.16 (vs) 'thou wilt not arise from the seat-of-enlightenment'. In Mv ii.391.6 (vs) read with one ms. *bhotā* = *bhavitā* (v.l. *bhogā*; Senart em. *bhoti*). In RP 15.7 (vs) *bhavitā* is used with 3 pl. subject *te*, 'they will be'. In Śikṣ 46.12 (vs) *kartāsma* is m.c. for °*smaḥ*, 'we shall do'.

Optative and imperative of the future

31.37. These ('of the utmost rarity' in Skt., Whitney 938; cf. Renou, Gr. scte. § 340b, c) occur very rarely here too. Mv i.267.9 (prose) *kārayiṣyet* 'would have made'; future optative with the sense of a conditional, see § 31.40. Read *anucintayiṣye* for °*yeta* SP 114.14 (vs). — *gamiṣyatu* Divy 220.10, future imperative.

Conditional

31.38. The conditional is rare, but not unknown as stated by Sen 59. Like other augmented forms, it may be deprived of the augment (below, LV 403.16 *deśayiṣyaṃ*; *paśyiṣya* Mv iii.285.19; *prapatiṣyaṃ* 286.1; both with mss.).

31.39. A conditional in *-syaṃ*, *-iṣyaṃ* (°*yan*), historically 1 sg., is used occasionally as 3 sg. (all the following are prose): *sa ced* . . . *aśroṣyad ājñāsyan* (so text with all mss. except two *ajñāsyaṃ*, certainly 3 sg.) *tasmai cāhaṃ* . . . *dharmaṃ deśayiṣyaṃ na ca māṃ sa vyaheṭhayiṣyat* LV 403.15–17, 'if he had heard . . . he would have understood, and I would have preached the Law to him, and he would not have insulted me.' — *adhyāvasiṣyan* (mss.; Senart em. °*yat*), Mv iii.102.16; *yadi na kumāro pravrajito abhaviṣyaṃ* (Senart em. °*ṣya*) 107.3; *adhyāvasiṣyaṃ* (Senart em. °*ya*) 107.9; *abhaviṣyaṃ* (Senart em. °*yat*) 107.10; *paśyiṣya* (3 sg., so mss.; Senart em. *paśyitva*, which is certainly wrong; probably read *paśyiṣyaṃ* in accord with the following) *so jitaṃ mūrchitvā prapatiṣyaṃ* (mss.; Senart em. °*yad*) *vā* . . . *kālaṃ akariṣyaṃ* (mss.; Senart em. °*yat*) 285.19–286.2. All these forms are certainly 3 sg. conditional. In Mv iii.335.13 (prose) *abhaviṣyat*, followed by *na*, may be the true reading; however, one ms. reads *abhaviṣyan*, followed by a daṇḍa, and then *na*; the form is certainly 3 sg., and *abhaviṣyan* could be interpreted as equivalent to °*ṣyaṃ*. Repeated in the following with the same v.l.

31.40. A future, with primary endings, but sometimes augmented, is occasionally used in the sense of a conditional: *yadi tathāgato* . . . *nābhaviṣyati* Mv i.267.7 (so mss., Senart em. *na bha*°; cf. § 32.8), 'if the Tathāgata had not become . . .' (the apodosis, line 9, has *kārayiṣyet*, fut. opt., § 31.37); unaugmented forms, Mv iii.102.14 *mama putro yadi na pravrajiṣyati, rājā bhaviṣyati*, 'if my son had not left the world, he would have become king' (in line 16 *medinīm adhyāvasiṣyan*, mss., 'he would have dwelt in the earth').

32. Aorist, or Preterite (including imperfect)

32.1. Of the Prakrits treated by Pischel (452), none preserves the imperfect, except for the isolated *āsi, āsī*, and AMg. *abbavī* (assimilated to the aorist); and only AMg. preserves the aorist. In Pali the aorist is fully alive, but the imperfect hardly exists, at least independently: 'both (aor. and impf.) merge for the most part in the preterite called aorist' (Geiger 120). This was apparently equally true of our dialect originally. Except as partly Sanskritized, it does not permit treatment of the imperfect as separate from the aorist. The few remarks called for on the imperfect will be found in the section on the augment and in some later sections, especially that on the thematic aorist (§§ 32.110 ff.). Perhaps 'preterite' might be a better heading for this chapter than 'aorist'; but I have followed the example of Geiger's grammar of Pali, where the conditions appear to be similar. After all, nearly all the forms here included are historically derived from aorists.

Augment

32.2. Any clear notion of the original meaning of the augment was evidently lost in the Prakrit underlying BHS, as in MIndic generally. Most preterites in verses omit it, tho a considerable minority retain it. In the prose of Mv it is very commonly lacking. There is reason to believe that in the oldest form of the prose of our dialect it was omitted much more often than appears from most of our mss. and editions. Yet even these lack the augment in preterite forms not all too rarely. Striking is the form *pratijñāsiṣam* LV 418.15 (§ 1.46), in a piece of old canonical prose; no ms. records an augmented form here, tho in line 19 below some have *pratyaj°*. The interesting thing is that in the Pali form of the same passage, Vin. i.11.24, 29, the form (*paccaññāsiṃ*) is augmented. Thus it appears that even Pali sometimes kept the augment better (or restored it more?) than our language.

32.3. Abundant illustrations of augmentless preterite forms, mostly historic aorists, which are MIndic in other respects will be found thruout this chapter. To be sure, augmentless forms are by no means unknown in (especially) Epic Skt., Whitney 587d; they are probably due to MIndic influence. It seems worth while here to quote a few samples of augmentless forms which are otherwise normal Skt., and specifically imperfects. The following are all from prose except those marked (vs): *upasaṃkrāmat*, or pl. *°man* (also dual *°matām*, SP 458.7; 461.9), occurs very commonly in the locution *yena . . . tenopasaṃkrāmat*, etc. (or the like), e. g.: SP 75.3; 100.4; 183.1; 428.12, 13; 464.8; 472.9; LV 4.15; 50.17, 20; 238.5; RP 54.2. And from the same root, *prakrāmat* LV 142.19; 245.15; 246.2; 405.3; *prakrāman* LV 264.21; *avakrāmad* LV 55.5.

32.4. Others (in 3 pl. forms final *n* sometimes written *ṃ*): *abhyavakirat* SP 6.1; *aparādhyam iti* 104.5, for *apā°* 1 sg. impf.; the reading *aparādhyāmīti*, 1 sg. pres., adopted by WT from their ms. K′ is probably only a lect. fac.; no v.l. in KN; *saṃpādayetām* 105.14; *pratiṣṭhateti* LV 20.12 (i. e. *°ta — iti*); *kuruta* (with 3 pl. subject, 'they made') 81.16 (vs); *avatīryata* 86.18 (text uncertain, cf. Weller 48, but this form seems probable); *upapadyata* 98.4 (so Lefm. with best ms., the others *upapannā*); *janayaṃ* (= *°yan*) 135.18 (vs); *pramuñcat* 219.20 (vs); *upagacchan* (v.l. *upatasthur*) 265.2; *lobhayaṃ* (= *°yan*) 326.5 (vs) 'they seduced'; *vadaṃ* (= *°dan*) 326.18 (vs); in 351.22 Lefm. with mss. *avabhāsyantaḥ*, cf. Weller 35, read probably *avabhāsyanta* with Calc. and also in 352.8 where 3 mss. with Calc. *°nta*; *abhyudīkṣan* 416.12 (vs).—*prajāyata* Mv i.305.3 (vs); *kārayat* 11.115.9 (?preceded by *prāsādā*, perhaps understand *akārayat* in saṃdhi?); *pramuhyata* RP 9.6 (vs); *pratikṣipan* Śikṣ 47.4 (vs); *prāviṣkārṣīt* Av i.10.5 (ms. *°kāṣīt*); *samavasthiṣata* (to root *sthā*) Gv 403.10; *anupraviśan* 439.9.

32.5. The augment is sometimes put before a preverb or between two preverbs (cf. Renou, Gr. scte. 403, § 283c, note): *upāsaṃkrāmat* LV 108.4; *upāsaṃkrāman* 142.2; *apreṣaye* Mv i.128.16 (all prose).

32.6. As occasionally in Skt. (Whitney 579e), augmented forms are sometimes used with *mā* in prohibitions: (*mā*) . . . *akārṣuḥ* LV 89.10 (prose); and in vss, *avaci* Mv ii.482.8; *avaca* iii.17.14; *anvagā* 457.15 (these MIndic forms will be cited below).

32.7. There is even a case where we seem to find an unaugmented imperfect form with imperative force in a non-negative sentence, as in the Vedic injunctive. I doubt, however, any historic relation to the latter; if textually sound, it is probably a neologism, analogical to the similar use with *mā* in prohibitions: *unnehi me pāramitābhir ārye, puṇyair acintyaiś ca vivardhayaś ca* Gv 346.15 (vs), '. . . and increase me with unthinkable merits' (note parallel impv. *unnehi*). Note that aorist forms seem also to be used with injunctive force (§§ 32.119 ff.); but as they also may have 'potential' force, we have treated them as historic aorists with optative meaning.—If the text is rightly printed, another case would be Gv 488.16 (vs) *utthiho kilamatho na suvrata*, 'arise! (may there be) no fatigue (for you) . . .'; *utthihas*, unaugmented imperfect to *utthihati*. But two lines below occurs *utthi* 'arise!' (§ 29.11), and we should probably read here *utthi ho* (= *aho*).

32.8. The lack of association of the augment with past time is strikingly shown by the fact that present forms may be augmented. (Cf. § 31.40 and Senart Mv i n. 374.) Especially common, in Mv, are such forms from compounds of *bhāṣ* 'speak', as *adhyabhāṣati* Mv i.81.3; 83.2; ii.66.16; 68.10; 84.17; 85.3; 198.21; 199.10; 207.4; 244.18; 405.18; iii.28.12; 211.2; 215.17; 216.4, 16; 281.16; 451.13; *adhyabhāṣate* i.122.10; 154.5; iii.457.7 (mss.); *samadhyabhāṣati* (or better with v.l. *samabhāṣati*) ii.144.1; *pratyabhāṣati* ii.86.13; 87.1, 4; 207.7; 235.13; 236.14; 245.3; iii.14.16; 186.6, 9; 215.12; 216.1, 9; 282.1. Most of these are prose; a few have the v.l. *°bhāṣe* (aorist); but they are so numerous (the list is not complete) and well attested that no doubt is possible. Mv i.6.9 ff. (prose) also has *pratyahanyanti*, six times, with hardly any variation in the mss., tho elsewhere regular forms in *prati-han°* or *pratyā-han°* occur.

32.9. This phenomenon is clearly based on the use of equivalent augmented and augmentless preterite forms. Either *adhibhāṣe* or *adhyabhāṣe* may be used to mean 'he (or I) said', or indeed, the distinction between present and past being not rigid, 'he (or I) say'. So to *adhibhāṣate* (*°ti*) is formed *adhyabhāṣate* (*°ti*).

32.10. In other texts than Mv few such cases have been noted, but enough to help confirm the usage. In LV 122.11 Lefm. reads *adhibhāṣate sma* with his best ms., but most mss. with Calc. *adhyabhāṣate sma*, which may well be the true reading (as in Mv above). Gv 50.13 (prose) has *pratyalabhante*, which is not an error or misprint for *pratyā°*, since the noun *pratilābha* follows and confirms it.

32.11. In Pali, an impv. *amāpaya* and a ger. *amāpetvā* are found, from an augmented aor. *amāpayiṃ* etc. (caus. of root *mā*); see CPD s.v. (*amāpeti*); but the pres. indic. is not recorded with augment.

32.12. There is even an optative form with augment, *abhyaṣiñcet*, repeatedly in Mmk 51.4; 58.19; 528.24 (all prose). Note also the transformation of augmented aorists into quasi-presents in *addṛśāti*, *addaśāmi*, § 32.58.

Confusion of person and number

32.13. As with verb forms generally, forms that were originally 3 sg. are often used for any person and number; and the same is true to some extent of original 2 sg. and 3 pl. forms, as in AMg. (Pischel 516); see §§ 25.19–22, 28, 30–33.

Conspectus of preterites

32.14. The commonest aorist forms are descendants of the Skt. *iṣ*-aorist. Especially common are *i* and *ī*, originally (2 and) 3 sg., from Skt. (*īs* and) *īt*; the distinctive 3 pl. *iṣu* is also common, *iṃsu* or *insu* less common. They are all formed from thematic present stems. Next in frequency are descendants of Skt. *s* (and *siṣ*) aorists. They are regularly affixed to bases in long vowels, especially *ā* (often identical with Skt. roots in *ā*) and *e* (often representing Skt. *aya*). Original optative forms in *e*(*t*), and sometimes others, are used as preterites. There is also a 3 pl. ending *etsu*(*ḥ*), *ensu*(*ḥ*) or the like. Descendants of the Skt. root-aorist are nearly limited to forms of the root *bhū*. Of thematic aorists (and occasionally imperfects), the commonest are from the root *vac*; also from *gam*, *dṛś*, and a few others. We shall close this chapter with some syntactic peculiarities: aorist forms are used with meanings which suggest the optative or the future.

Descendants of the Skt. *iṣ*-aorist

32.15. From the *iṣ*-aorist is derived the commonest aorist type in our dialect. It was evidently indefinitely productive from thematic presents in the underlying Pkt. The standard ending is *i* or (less often) *ī*,[1] originally 2 and 3 sg. (Skt. *īs*, *īt*), but here used for all persons and numbers. Fairly common also are distinctively 3 pl. endings corresponding to Skt. *iṣuḥ* (here *iṣu*, *iṃsu*, etc.; details below). Other, more sporadic endings will be noted later. All these endings, like most other endings of the verb system, are normally added to thematic present stems, minus the thematic vowel *a*. This was apparently the case with the corresponding forms in Pali and AMg., tho it is not stated in such a formal generalization by Geiger (but see his 167) or Pischel (516). There are, however—aside from regular Skt. *iṣ*-aorist forms, which may be suspected of being secondary intrusions here in some sense—also some MIndic forms, or at least forms not known to standard Skt., which originate from either Skt. *iṣ*-aorist types or from other than thematic present bases. Some examples were mentioned in JAOS 57.19 and 27 (§§ 6, 21, 22); others will be cited below.

32.16. The ending ī. Tho much less common than *i*, this is well established, as also in Pali and AMg. (Geiger 166 ff.; Pischel 516) where it seems to be still rarer than in our dialect. It cannot, however, be assumed to be merely a metrical lengthening for *i*, since it occurs in Mv prose, and in metrically indifferent positions, as at the end of lines and pādas in SP.

1 sg. (vss): *prayojayī* 'I have employed' SP 90.5 (end of pāda); *otarī* Gv 256.13 and 257.5.

2 sg.: *uddharī*, LV 195.12, *saṃpaśyī* 20; *khedayī* 221.8 (all vss).

3 sg. (vss except as indicated): *avabhāsayī* SP 9.4, etc. (see list JAOS 57.22). — *nāmayī* LV 74.2; *gacchī* 81.11, etc. (see list, l. c.). — *udīrayī* Mv i.67.3; *nimantrayī* 113.4; *acarī* 155.13 (so with mss., Senart *avacī*: 'to him came a throng of gods with sweet speech as follows'); *prarodī* ii.32.11 (prose); *āgamī* iii.306.12, repeated in the sequel (sometimes with v.l. °*mi*). — *alapī* Laṅk 23.14. — *kṣipī* Dbh.g. 14(350).10, *ālapī* 21 (so read with mss.; in both these meter is indifferent as to *ī* or *i*). — *darśayī* Gv 240.24; *upasaṃkramī* 255.20; *udān'* (for *udānam*) *udānayī* 489.11. — *deśayī*, *vijñapī* Samādh 8.22; *bhāvayī* 8.30 (in these three at end of lines); *niścarī* 8.25; *upāgamī* 8.26; *pravrajī* 8.28; *ārāgayī* 8.30. — *upasaṃkramī* Suv 148.4; *adhivāsayī* 149.11; 150.6, read *abhyokirī* (to *abhyavakirati*); *niryātayī* 152.10.

3 pl. (vss except as indicated): *vivardhayī* SP 131.1, etc. (see list JAOS 57.23). — *kṣipī* LV 92.16, etc. (see list ibidem). — *kurvī* (to *kurvati*, § 28.6) Mv i.223.19 = ii.26.12 (prose); *phalī* ii.349.17. — (?)*samakarī* Dbh.g. 48(74).11. Doubtful; if a verb form, must be 3 pl. aor. from *sam* + *kṛ* 'scatter'; but we should expect *sam-ākirī*; no **karati* or equivalent seems to be recorded anywhere from this root, unless JM. *ukkariya* (Jacobi, Ausgew. Erz. 17.9). Possibly a noun form? There is a v.l. *śama-karī*. — *osarī* Gv 241.13 (end of line); *samosarī* 258.20; *sthapī* 383.17 (end of rathoddhatā pāda).

32.17. The ending i. This is regular for 2 and 3 sg. in Pali and AMg., and in our dialect also for other persons and both numbers, particularly 1 sg. and 3 pl. (Sometimes this occurs also in Pali, cf. Geiger 168 *apassi* 'I saw', and in AMg. at least in forms with *s* before the *i*, Pischel 516, e. g. *akāsi*, *āsi*.) It cannot be regarded as mere metrical shortening for *ī* (Skt. *īs*, *īt*) since it is extremely common in prose (as well as vss) of Mv. In other texts it has not been found in prose, but occurs in positions where meter is indifferent as to quantity of the final *i*. The following examples, then, are all from verses except for Mv; examples from that text, on the contrary, will be chosen entirely from prose, except for cases marked (vs).

1 sg.: *bhaṇi* SP 56.6; (*saṃkṣobhi*? 56.8[2];) *deśayi* 57.14. — [?*praṇipati* LV 361.19; but this is probably a present with *i* for *e*, § 26.3.] — *prakrami* Mv i.56.5; in i.246.19 (vs), read *vivari mukhaṃ*; *prakrāmi* 327.7, 13; *uparundhi* ii.124.10; *niṣīdi* 131.14. — *nirhari* Bhad 6[2]. — *kampayi* Gv 231.15, *pravartayi* 18. — *nadi* Sukh 24.2.

2 sg.: *labhi* LV 166.14; *jani* (*mā khu jani viṣādu*, 'do not become despondent') 91.17; *tyaji* 165.9 etc. (others, see JAOS 57.21). — *paribhāṣi* Mv ii.93.1; *mā pramādyi* iii.124.18 'be not negligent' (to *pramādyate*); these all vss; on *mā bhīhi* 'fear not' ii.489.6 and 16 (prose) cf. § 30.10.

---

1. On the incomplete evidence of SP and LV, I was inclined in JAOS 57.19 to regard *ī* as the normal ending, and *i* as m.c. for it. The mass of evidence from Mv, particularly, disproves this. Both *i* and *ī* are found, even in prose, but *i* is much commoner. This seems to be equally true of Pali and AMg.: Geiger 166, Pischel 516.

2. Taken by Burnouf and Kern as a 1 sg. verb, but intrans., not caus.; if so, an instance of a caus. form (minus the *aya*) in non-caus. sense (§§ 38.23, 32). But I see no objection to interpretation as loc. sg. of a noun, = *saṃkṣobhe*.

3 sg.: *ādhārayi* SP 25.10, etc. (see list JAOS 57.22). — *cali* LV 92.3, etc. (see list ibidem).—*acari* Mv i.3.9; 4.4; *upāgami* 4.3; *prakrami* 34.15; *prakrāmi* 35.3; *adhyabhāṣi* 35.13; 97.4; *ādeśayi* 130.3, *praviśi* 4; *yāci* 132.11; *adhyāvasi* 193.20; *upasaṃkrami* 255.10; *niṣīdi* 319.1; 325.15; *antarahāyi* ii.256.11; *ayāci* 264.7; *praveśi* iii.162.5; *saṃtarpayi*, *saṃpravārayi* 257.10; etc., common. — *vadi* Gv 212.13; *phari* 240.25; *vyāhari* 488.26 (end of line). — *abhāṣi* Dbh.g. 14(350).11. — *avakiri* Sukh 24.18; *gami* 51.16.

3 pl.: *darśayi* SP 49.7, etc. (see list JAOS 57.23). — *upagami* LV 49.7, etc. (see list ibidem). — *upāgami* Mv i.11.16 (vs), iii.1.8 (vs); *prakrāmi* i.57.1; *abhigacchi* 150.12 (vs); *niṣīdi* ii.29.4; *āgami* 35.14; *osiri* (Senart em. *okiri*) 349.16; etc., common. — *vyutthihi* (to *vyutthihati* = °*tiṣṭhati*) Śikṣ 344.1 ff. — *upāgami* Gv 34.16, *cari* 18; *samosari* 231.1; *eṣi* (to *eṣati*, °*te*, 'seeks') 236.12; *upapadyi* 285.25. — *prāpuṇi* Sukh 52.16.

32.18. Special forms of the endings ī and i. Inherited from regular Skt. *acārīt* (aor. of root *car*), but with MIndic ending, is the 3 sg. *acāri* Ud xxxi.5 (vs). In Mv ii.272.5 (prose) text has *adrākṣī*, but the regular Skt. *adrākṣīn* (for °*īt*) is recorded as v.l.

32.19. Perhaps in direct analogy to *acārīt*, *acāri*, our language shows an aorist *avasāri*, to *avasarati*, 'arrived at' or 'entered into'. But it seems more likely that this is based on the 'causative' -*sārayati*, used in the sense of the simplex; see § 38.23.

32.20. The inherited Skt. imperfects *āsīs*, *āsīt* — originally formed in analogical imitation of *iṣ*-aorists (for Vedic *ās*) — are to be considered *iṣ*-aorists here; they often appear as *āsi* and *āsī*, for all persons and numbers. Thus *āsi* as 1 sg. SP 62.13; Mv i.269.11 (vs); ii.94.2 (vs), etc.; as 2 sg. SP 312.15; LV 167.21; Mv i.269.8; 276.10; ii.186.19 (all vss); as 3 sg. SP 27.6; LV 76.1; 194.3; Mv i.48.16 (prose); 54.3 (prose); 113.5 (vs), etc.; as 1 pl. Mv iii.45.20 (vs); as 3 pl. Mv iii.1.11 etc. And *āsī* as 1 sg. Mv ii.133.3 (prose; v.l. *āsīt*!); as 2 sg. LV 168.15; 169.1, 9 (many mss. *āsīd* each time); as 3 sg. Mv ii.94.2 (vs); 109.17 (prose, v.l. *āsīt*); 342.4 (vs); as 1 pl. Mv iii.43.8 (prose, v.l. *āsīt*); as 3 pl. Mv iii.1.11 (vs); SP 195.1 (vs).

32.21. Here may likewise be included *abravī* 3 sg. Mv ii.61.10 (vs; v.l. *abravīt*), also a historic imperfect which resembles the aorists in our dialect (AMg. *abbavī*, Pali *abravī*).

32.22. Otherwise, most of the non-Skt. *i* and *ī* aorist forms are obviously based on thematic present stems. These latter are often MIndic, not Skt.; they will be found in my Chap. 43. They may even be Skt. passives, as Mv ii.328.2 (vs) *saṃpravādyi* (3 pl.) 'they were sounded' (to *saṃpravādyate*, pass. of °*vādayati*). Other examples are cited, with the thematic presents underlying them, in JAOS 57.20–21. It is also noted there that presents in -*aya*- may either keep or drop -*ay*- before aorist endings, as they may in other forms: *deśayi* SP 57.14, but *snāpi* (to *snāpayati*) LV 271.12; see § 38.32.

32.23. A few such forms need special attention. In LV 197.1 *lehī* must be read, with v.l., for *lekhī*; cf. *parilehati* Mv iii.144.15 and Pali *parilehisaṃ* (Geiger 167.1) to Pali *lehati* (id. 130.5), doubtless a blend of Skt. *leḍhi* and *lihati*. In Mv iii.299.11 (vs) occurs the interesting *khāyi* 'ate', based on a Prakritic **khāyati* = Skt. *khādati* (see Dict.); Pali has the past pple. *khāyita* (according to PTSD 'on analogy of *sāyita*, with which frequently combined', but rather with Geiger 36 showing Pkt. loss of intervocalic stop with *y-śruti*; § 2.32), but no finite verb forms. In LV 165.22 occurs *chini* 'cut', cf. Chap. 43, s.v. *chid* (2), to *achinat*, whence **chinati*. The aor. *anubuddhi* LV 299.12 belongs to the present *buddhati*, discussed § 28.19.

32.24 From the root *vac* occurs *avacī* LV 109.16; 165.14; 199.11; 304.3; Mv i.112.3 (all vss); and *avaci* LV 135.1; 329.7; 370.14; Mv i.113.15; 202.15; ii.482.8 (2 sg.); iii.111.5; 134.13; 269.7 etc. (all vss); according to the mss. also *avaciṃ* as 3 pl. Mv i.247.4 (see § 32.39). These forms, the like of which seem not recorded in any MIndic, are clearly adaptations of the aorist *avaca* etc. (found in our dialect, § 32.113, as well as in Pali) to the common aorist type in *ī*, *i*. No thematic present *vacati* is noted in Pali, but our language has *vaced*, 3 sg. opt., SP 258.4, thus guaranteeing a present stem *vaca*-, abstracted from *avaca* which was assimilated to thematic imperfects. Sheth cites *vaai*, *vaae*, allegedly presents of *vac*, from the Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā; but such forms might belong to *vad*.

32.25. Somewhat similar are forms like (*ad*)*dṛśi* and the like, from root *dṛś*. Our language has the form *addaśā*, identical with Pali *addasā* (§ 32.111). Historically it stems from thematic aorists of *dṛś* (Vedic type *adṛśat*), whence BHS *dṛśati*, § 28.12 and Chap. 43. (Cf. also *addaśetsuḥ* etc., § 32.103, and *addaśāsi* etc., § 32.57.) Or we could interpret (*a*)*dṛśi* as a direct modification of *adṛśat*, or its MIndic descendants, in imitation of the common aorists ending in *i*, *ī*. Such forms are written, when the augment is present, with either single or double *d*, but in verses the meter regularly proves that *dd* was pronounced. In Pali too we regularly find *addasa* etc., with *dd*. As has long been recognized, *dd* in such forms is due to contamination from forms like Pali *addakkhi*, stemming from Skt. *adrākṣīt*. Examples of the relevant forms (all from vss) are: *addaśi* SP 9.8 (1 sg.; mss. *addarśi*, metrically impossible); LV 194.12, 22 (most mss. both times *adaśi*, *adṛśi*, unmetr.); Mv ii.37.9 (v.l. *adarśi*); 222.6 (emend. Senart, plausibly); *adṛśi* (pronounced with *dd* where metrical evidence is conclusive) LV 194.15; 197.15, 17; *dṛśi* LV 230.4; Mv ii.299.9 (mss. *dṛśī*, Senart em. m.c.); *dṛśī* (or *adṛ*°) LV 194.13, 14; 197.5.

32.26. There are other *i*-aorists from the root *dṛś*. Isolated is Mv ii.54.3 (vs) *anudrakṣi*. It is doubtless based on a Sktized present **drakṣati* = Pali *dakkhati* (also *dakkhiti*), on which see § 28.41; Geiger 136.3; less likely a direct semi-Sanskritization of Pali (*anu* +)*addakkhi* (= *adrākṣīt*).

32.27. More numerous are forms showing guṇa in the root syllable: *adarśi*, °*śī*, *add*°. With these may be compared Pali *adassiṃ* Cariyāp. i.2.2 (Geiger 166), 1 sg., and *addarśā*, below § 32.111. They may be interpreted as based on the type (*ad*)*dṛśa*, °*śi*, (*ad*)*daśā* etc., blended with normal-grade forms of the root containing *darś*-; but note also that *adarśam* is known to Skt. Spellings with both *d* and *dd* occur. But, tho they usually are found in verses, generally either the meter is indifferent, or it is in such bad shape that we cannot draw safe inferences from it. However, in Mv ii.13.5 meter requires *adarśi*, which Senart rightly reads, tho his mss. have *addarśi* or *addaśi*. (Repetitions in ii.13.9, 13, 17 show -*rś*- always in the mss., which vary between *dd* and *d*.) And in Mv iii.245.1, where mss. have *addarśi* or *adarśī*, Senart is probably right in printing *adarśi*, tho the line is in bad shape in other respects. The only prose occurrence noted is Mv ii.400.10, where *addarśi* and *adarśi* are both recorded. Others: *darśī* Mv i.303.15 (Senart *adarśī* m.c.); *adarśī* 305.18; *adarśi* ii.35.17, v.l. *add*°; iii.12.6 = 17 mss. *addarśī*, °*śi*, *adarśi* (1 sg., Senart em. °*śiṃ*; meter inconclusive); *vidarśi* (3 pl.) LV 49.10.

32.28. From the root *bhū* occurs, at least in composition with *prādur*-, a 3 sg. aor. *ahi*: *prādur-ahi* 'appeared' Mv ii.221.17; iii.216.7 (vss; so mss. both times; Senart wrongly em. °*ahu*). It apparently represents a MIndic *ahu* (= *abhūt*), adapted to the regular aorist ending in *i*. Possibly *hī* in LV 230.9 (vs) *stemito hī* is likewise to be interpreted as = *ahi* (=*abhūt*) with *ī* m.c. (?) rather than the particle *hi*, which does not seem very plausible in the context. The genuineness of the form (*prādur*-)*ahi* is guranteed by similar forms in Pali: *pātur-ahiṃsu* 3 pl.

Jāt. i.54.5 (v.l. °*ahaṃsu*); *pātur-ahaṃsu* ib. i.11.2; *anv-abhī*, to *anubhoti* (CPD); *ajjhabhī, adhibhaṃsu*, to *adhibhavati* (ib.). The Pali forms -*ahaṃsu*, -*bhaṃsu*, are similarly altered to match the pattern (*adā*:) *adaṃsu*, Geiger 163 (or perhaps in the case of *pātur-a*° more precisely to forms of *antar-dhā*, see Chap. 43, s.v. *bhū* 7).

32.29. Distinctive 3 pl. forms. While *i, ī* are often used with 3 pl. subject, we also often find MIndic 3 pl. endings related to Skt. *iṣuḥ*. (They are even used for other persons and singular number, e. g. § 32.31.) Like *i, ī* they are normally added to thematic present bases minus -*a*. In AMg. this ending appears as *iṃsu*; in Pali both in this form and as *isuṃ*. In the Pkt. underlying our dialect the common form of the ending was probably *isu* (as in Aśokan), direct phonetic heir of Skt. *iṣuḥ*. In our texts it is usually *iṣu*. Unlike Pali, it (again like Aśokan) never shows final anusvāra. When meter requires a long final syllable, the *u* is generally lengthened; we rarely find -*uḥ* or equivalent as in Skt. Infrequently *s* is written for *ṣ*, but this means little; there is much confusion in the writing of sibilants. When meter requires a long penult (rarely otherwise, and only for special morphological reasons), *i* may be lengthened to *ī*. But more often the alternative ending *iṃsu* is used, in one of its curiously various forms or spellings. With this, too, the final syllable may be lengthened m.c., usually to *ū*, sometimes to the *uḥ* of Skt. or its saṃdhi equivalent. The sibilant in this ending is almost always written *s*, very rarely *ṣ*, in contrast to *iṣu* for which *isu* is rare. Doubtless *n* for *ṃ* is purely orthographic; at least we find the two often interchanging in other situations. Even *itsu*, with *t* for *n* or *ṃ*, is recorded, at least in some mss.; on this, and on *eṃsu*, *etsu* (also °*uḥ*, etc.), see § 32.97, 98.

32.30. 3 pl. iṣu and congeners. These are nearly restricted to verses; even Mv, in strange contrast to its usual habits, seems not to use *iṣu* in prose, where *etsu*(*ḥ*) seems to replace it (§ 32.103); even in verses Mv uses *iṣu* chiefly where *etsu* would be metrically bad. In the prose of LV 397.21 occurs *antara-dhāyiṣuḥ* or (with the best ms. and others) °*ṣu*, from the MIndic present *antaradhāyati* 'disappears'. No prose case has been noted in the text of SP as printed, but cf. the Kashgar rec. v.l. at 181.9 *udgṛhṇīṣu dhārayiṣu paryāpuniṣu*, and Lüders (Hoernle MR 152) *saṃprakampayiṣu* for *saṃprakampitāḥ* 270.12. The following are all in verses, except as stated:

32.31. *iṣu*: *kurviṣu, paśyiṣu, krīḍiṣu, krandiṣu* (see JAOS 57.24) all from SP; *hiṃsiṣu, gacchiṣu*, etc. (see loc. cit.) all from LV; *avagāhiṣu* Mv i.11.1; *vikurviṣu* 64.3; *parijāgriṣu* 76.4 (Dict.); *caṃkramiṣu* 189.8; *pramuñciṣu* 219.8; ii.141.11; *anubandhiṣu* ii.198.11; *prabhāsiṣu* 307.1; *abhigṛhniṣu* (with v.l.) 307.7; *janayiṣu* 333.17; *upapadyiṣu* 350.7 = iii.274.9.—In Gv 34.21, read *bhadra* (= *bhadrāṃ*) *budhyiṣu*; *paśyiṣu* 231.10; *otariṣu* 240.18; *vipaśyiṣu* 241.10; *saṃdṛśyiṣu* 'were seen' 267.2; *upapadyiṣu* 286.1. — *prekṣiṣu* Dbh.g. 27(53).6; (*a*)*bhikiriṣu* 30(56).1. — *antara-hāyiṣu* Suv 158.1. — *śikṣiṣu* Sukh 74.6. — *kurviṣu* Samādh 22.4; *prabudhyiṣu* 22.5. In Mv i.304.20 the mss. read *upapadyiṣu* with a 3 sg. subject; it is unnecessary to emend with Senart to *upapadyitha*, § 25.32.

32.32. *isu*: *paśyisu* SP 194.7; *snapayisu* (v.l. °*yiṃsu*, unmetrical) LV 234.4; *gacchisu* Śikṣ 347.2.

32.33. *iṣū*: *parihāyiṣū* SP 170.2; *adhyeṣiṣū* 190.11, 191.3; *paśyiṣū* 323.14. — *gacchiṣū, virociṣū* etc. LV (see JAOS 57.24). — *niścariṣū* Gv 236.5.

32.34. *īsu*: *vartīsu* (v.l. *varttisu*, unmetr.) LV 402.14. —Of different character are *udgṛhṇīṣu, āsīsu*, § 32.37.

32.35. *īṣu, īṣū* (?): *kārāpayīṣū* SP 50.16; 51.1. But probably the true reading is °*yiṃsū*, which was read in 50.16 by one of Burnouf's sources according to a manuscript note left by him of which I have seen a photostat; while on 51.1 the Kashgar rec. reads °*yiṃsu*. — *prapatīṣu* (v.l. first time, both mss. 2d time; Senart °*tiṣu*, interpreting as noun, see Dict. s.v. *prapati*) Mv ii.326.10; 333.15.

32.36. *iṣuḥ, iṣus*: the normal Skt. ending, in a form otherwise Prakritic, occurs in LV 282.16 *kṣipiṣus*, where the meter requires a long final. LV 397.21 (prose) *antaradhāyiṣu*(*ḥ*) was noted in § 32.30. In Mv i.99.15 (vs) Senart reads *pratisthihiṣur vanaṃ* for mss. *pratisthiṣu vrataṃ*; but *pratisthihiṣū* would be an equally acceptable emendation. In AsP 17.7; 140.12, and elsewhere, in prose, we find *uttrasiṣuḥ saṃtrasiṣuḥ*, based on *trasati*, and probably MIndic, although Wh. Roots notes *atrasīt* as authorized by grammarians.

32.37. -*su*, added to quasi 'stem'-final *ī*. We have mentioned above (§ 32.30) the form *udgṛhṇīṣu*, recorded in the Kashgar rec. of SP, in prose. It is obviously based on the Skt. weak present stem *gṛhṇī*-, with an aorist ending. Somewhat similar is *āsīsu* 'they were' Mv ii.305.18 (vs), if this is the true reading (note *su*, not *ṣu*). There is a v.l. *āsītsu*. It is evidently a plural to match the 3 sg. *āsī* (§ 32.20), or *āsīt*, on the model of such forms as *gacchi*: *gacchiṣu*, or perhaps *gacche*(*t*): *gacchetsu* (§ 32.98). Parallel to *āsītsu*, if this is the true reading, is (*a*)*bravītsu*, Mv i.186.11 (vs); Senart em. °*īnsu*. Cf. *abravīṣi* § 32.71.

32.38. 3 pl. iṃsu and congeners. These are much rarer than the preceding, but are less limited to occurrence in verses; they occur in prose in Mv as well as in that of Suv and of the Kashgar rec. of SP. They are written either *iṃsu* or *insu*; the difference I believe to be purely orthographic. Occasionally the writing *itsu* also occurs; what this means must be considered together with the writing *etsu*(*ḥ*) for *ensu*(*ḥ*), §§ 32.95 ff. The final *u* may be lengthened m.c. The sibilant is almost always written *s*, very rarely *ṣ* (indeed I have noted only one such case). Sometimes *ḥ* is added to the ending. In the following, prose passages are so marked.

iṃsu: *abhistaviṃsu* SP 191.3; *avaciṃsu* 192.10 (cf. § 32.24; Kashgar rec. °*nsu*, one Nep. ms. °*tsu*); *śrāvayiṃsu* 194.5. — *nyasayiṃsu*, Lefm., read probably *nyasyiṃsu*, LV 222.3 (*ny-asyati*, 'cast down'); *ābhāṣayiṃsu* 353.6 (text *ābhās*°); *stavayiṃsu* 414.10. — *snapayiṃsu* Mv i.99.11; *pratisthihiṃsu* (v.l. °*suḥ*) 203.4; in parallel ii.6.21 Senart *pratiṣṭhihinsu*, mss. °*hinsuḥ*, °*hitsu*; *avaciṃsu* i.207.15 = ii.12.5; same ii.227.15 (v.l. °*suḥ*, which seems better metrically); *pratiṣṭhihiṃsu* i.203.8 = ii.7 4 (vv.ll. °*hinsu*, °*hansuḥ*, °*hisuḥ*); *ninaṃdiṃsuḥ* iii.267.8 (v.l. °*tsuḥ*); *avaciṃsu* Suv 233.7 (Nobel with v.l. °*suḥ*, best ms. °*su*; end of line):

insu: prose, in Kashgar rec. of SP, *bhāṣinsuḥ* La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1074 for ed. 267.2 *abhāṣetām*; and in Lüders, Hoernle MR 152, *upasaṃkraminsu* for SP 270.11 and *nadinsu* for 271.2; Thomas, Hoernle MR 134, *pravartayinsu* for SP 327.11, and 136 *prādurbhavinsu* for 329.2, *prapatinsu* for 329.3; *prakraminsuḥ* Mv i.212.5 (v.l. °*tsuḥ*); *udīrinsuḥ* (v.l. °*tsuḥ*) iii.354.16.—Verses: *darśinsu* SP 55.12 (Nep. mss. °*śensu*, °*śansu*); in 50.3 ff. read probably *karinsu* with Kashgar rec., several times; Kashgar rec. also *kārāpayinsu* 51.1; *ālikhinsu* 51.6; *samādapinsu* (meter demands °*sū*) 51.8; *niryādayinsuś ca* 191.2; *snapinsu* LV 93.21 and 22 (in 22 most mss. °*tsu*); *upagaminsu* (v.l. °*tsu*) 94.21; in Mv i.208.11, mss. *karinsuḥ* or °*tsuḥ* (meter demands °*su*); in Suv 243.10 (prose), mss. *abhistavinsuḥ* or °*tsuḥ* (Nobel °*ṃsuḥ*).

iṃṣū: *raṇiṃṣū* LV 233.18; all mss. *ṣ*, the only case I have noted; in the same line *patiṃsū* (with *s*).

iṃsū: *saṃśrāvayiṃsū* SP 194.2 (KN °*su*, unmetr.); *kṣipiṃsū, bhrāmayiṃsū* LV 81.7; *patiṃsū* 233.18; *staviṃsū* 233.19.

itsu(*ḥ*): several times noted as v.l. above, also Kashgar rec. *parāhanitsu* for SP 69.11 *parāhananti* (prose); and with *t* in all mss. Mv i.200.12 = ii.4.9, mss. *praviṣitsuḥ*, °*varṣetsuḥ* (read the latter or °*varṣitsuḥ*), and *pramuṃcitsuḥ*; *pradhāvitsuḥ* i.220.19.

Other non-Sanskritic personal endings of *iṣ*-aorist type

32.39. Pali has a 1 sg. aorist in *iṃ*, corresponding to 3 sg. *i* (Geiger 166). A very few such forms, in *iṃ* or *īṃ*, have been found in our language: *darśayīṃ* (but vv.ll. °*yī*, °*yi*, *darśī*) SP 90.3 (vs): *avasāriṃ* Mv ii.119.6 and 123.16 (prose) (cf. § 32.19; v.l. °*ri* in 123.16). Senart assumes *āsiṃ* 'I was' (to *āsī*, *āsi* 'he was') in Mv i.229.3 (prose), but the mss. read corruptly *āsināṃ*; we cannot be sure that the text did not have *āsaṃ*. In Mv i.247.4 (vs) mss. *avaciṃ*, with 3 pl. subject, which is not particularly surprising. Senart em. to *avaci*, but meter requires a long final syllable (we must read *sarvaikavācam avaciṃ*, or *sarv' eka*°).

32.40. The 1 pl. ending *imha* of Pali is pretty surely to be recognized in Mv iii.434.2 (vs), where Senart reads *akarimha* with one ms.; the other has *akāri-* followed by a corrupt akṣara; meter requires *akārimha*, which read. Cf. *paricaremha* (?), § 26.7.

32.41. A few times Mv seems to present an ending *itha*, rarely *ithā*, possibly *ittha* (once or twice at most), and once apparently *ita*, which may correspond to Pali *ittha*, AMg. *ittha* or *itthā* (Geiger 159, Pischel 517), regarded as a 3 sg. middle aorist. The readings are not always certain. The subject is usually 3 sg., less often 3 pl.; on one or two apparent cases of 2 pl. subjects see below. Nearly all are in verses. In several cases the form is augmented. Cf. the forms in *atha* cited below § 32.117.

32.42. The following cases (3 sg. except as indicated) are more or less plausible: *jāyitha* (3 pl.), 'are produced' Mv i.10.13, in sense of pres. indic. or opt., generalizing statement; *avagāhitha* 11.5 (3 pl.; mss. *anugrāhitha*, but in parallel phrase 11.1 *avagāhiṣu*); *pratipadyitha* (four mss. °*ithe*) 12.9; *pravartitha* (3 pl.) 13.16; *upapadyitha* 268.14; 305.2; ii.220.7; and so Senart reads i.304.20, but mss. *upapadyiṣu* (3 sg. subject); (*saṃnipatitha*, i.329.17 (prose), not aorist but 2 pl. impv., 'assemble ye!,' for °*tatha*; see § 27.10;) *antarahāyithā* ii.240.17, v.l. °*tha*; *prajāyitha* iii.1.2; with augment, *adhyabhāṣitha* ii.56.18; *ajāyithā* iii.32.16 (end of vs, *ā* cannot be m.c.); *abhāṣitha* iii.438.11 (v.l. °*atha*). And once apparently *ita*: *adhyabhāṣita* iii.135.17 (augmented; v.l. °*ṣito* which is clearly impossible); cf. *abhūṣita* § 32.73. The forms in *ittha*, with double stop as in Pali and AMg., are not certain: *anucarittha* Mv iii.136.15, so Senart, but mss. °*itthe* or °*iṣṭaḥ* (the passage is corrupt and dubious, metrically and otherwise); (*caratha bhikṣavaḥ cārikāṃ*) *mā ca duve ekena agamittha* iii.415.9 'and do not go two with one!', 2 pl. impv. (in that case read °*itha*) or injunctive, cf. the impv. *saṃnipatitha* i.329.17, above; mss. here *āgamittha*, *agamirṣya*; repeated in line 15 with *agamittha*, v.l. *agamiṣyaṃ*. If this 2 pl. injunctive form is not a corruption, it may be related to Skt. forms in *-iṣ-ṭa*, in which case it would not concern the 3 sg. (or pl.) ending *itha* (or *ittha*).

32.43. Only in Mmk and only in vss, we find a number of 3 pl. aorist forms (note that *abhāṣire* has the augment) in *ire*. based like *i*, *iṣu* etc. on thematic presents (note *praṇaśyire*, *chindire*). We may compare the Pali ending *are* (Geiger 159.II), which may underlie these forms (blended with *i*, *iṣu* etc. as to vowel of the penult). Cf. also the perfects in *ure* (*tasthure* etc., § 33.5). Twice the subject is singular; cf. the similar use of *iṣu* etc., § 25.32: *praṇaśyire* Mmk 172.13; *abhāṣire* 231.20; *chindire* 366.13 (3 sg.); *prakampire* 512.19; 548.3 (3 sg. in the former); *krośire* 584.22; *bhāṣire* 630.4.

32.44. Other MIndic forms with Skt. iṣ-aorist endings. A few MIndic 3 pl. forms ending in *iṣuḥ* were mentioned in § 32.36. It has seemed best to reserve for this place a few other forms the endings of which are regular in the Skt. *iṣ*-aorist, but which are otherwise MIndic or at least not classical Skt.

32.45. The ending *īt*, instead of *ī* or *i*, sometimes occurs in forms of this sort. Like the latter, it may be affixed to a thematic stem, which may itself be MIndic. So *śraddadhīt* SP 113.10, to *śraddadhati*; *prābhañjīt* 159.1, to BHS and Pali *-bhañjati*; *abhyaṣṭavīt* RP 5.6 (prose), to BHS *stavati* (unless we should read °*ṣṭāvīt*, § 32.46). Probably class here *nyaṣīt* of LV 271.19, 'deposited, provided' (*bhadrāsanaṃ*), from *ni* + *as* 'throw'; see discussion JAOS 57.27 and § 2.60.

32.46. In other cases we find forms which could be Skt. forms of regular *iṣ*-aorist formation but which are doubtfully, if at all, attributable to normal Classical Skt. Thus RP 2.18 (prose) *abhyaṣṭāvīt* (cf. § 32.45); the form *astāvīt* is cited by Whitney Roots, as B.S. To this, *staviṣṭ(a)* LV 298.6 might be a regular Skt. 3 sg. middle, but for lack of augment and the fact that the subject is 3 pl.; meter, however, seems to demand *stāviṣṭ'*. So *onamiṣṭa* LV 295.7 might be a 3 sg. mid. **avānamiṣṭa*, but Whitney records no *iṣ*-aor. from root *nam*. Gv 334.25 has *akāriṣuḥ* 'they made' = *akārṣuḥ*; again Whitney records no *iṣ*-aor. from *kṛ*, altho *akāriṣam* is found in the Veda (VV I p. 190). (*mā*) *vilambiṣṭhāḥ* LV 217.11 (prose) could be a regular 2 sg. middle; Whitney cites *alambiṣṭa* from grammarians but not from literature.

Descendants of Skt. *s* and *siṣ* aorists, and similar forms

32.47. These aorist forms are typically used after bases in long vowels, as in Pali (Geiger 167, cf. 163, 165.2); Pischel 516 contains material which suggests that the same was true of AMg., though he does not formulate it thus. Some such forms were inherited from Skt., as *ajñāsi* from *ajñāsīt*; (*a*)*nesi* may perhaps be similarly a direct inheritance from *anaiṣīt*, as *aśroṣīt* and *aśroṣi* certainly are from *aśrauṣīt*. Most of the non-Skt. forms here recorded are, however, analogical creations.

32.48. Some of these are individual and sporadic, though they may be extremely common, like *abhūṣi* from *bhū*, which has no exact analogue (and incidentally is not precisely paralleled in any recorded MIndic dialect known to me). Sometimes however they fall into patterns which, in the underlying Prakrit, were evidently productive to a rather large extent, at any rate considerably beyond the range of inherited Skt. forms. One of these is the group in which *s*-endings are attached to a base in *ā*, usually a Skt. root in *ā*. Skt. already had a fair number of such forms (*ajñāsīt*, *ayāsīt*, *ahāsīt*, etc.; lists at the end of Whitney's Roots); these are recorded in my lists when they show non-Skt. endings (*ajñāsi* etc.). But we also find quite a number which are not Skt., or at least not standard literary classical Skt. (e. g. *adāsīt*, *asthāsīt*). For the 3 pl. in *āsu*(*ḥ*) etc. see § 32.75.

32.49. Moreover other roots than those in original *ā* are drawn into this pattern, as in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 163.4, 165; Pischel 516); so from *kṛ* we find (*a*)*kāsi* (so Pali and AMg.). Probably, as Geiger suggests, on the model of pairs of non-sigmatic and sigmatic aorists (*akā*: *akāsi*, *adā* : *adāsi*), Pali forms *addasāsi* to *addasā* or °*sa*. Our language has the same, as *addaśāsi*, *a*(*d*)*dṛśāsi*, etc.; also *agamāsi* (= Pali id., cf. BHS and Pali *agamā*, °*ma*). And finally, since *agama*(*t*) etc. fall into the pattern of thematic imperfects, any thematic present may form an aorist in *-āsi*. Such forms are to be sure not common (*āmantrayāsi*, *praviśāsi*), but occur sporadically also in Pali (1 sg. *pivāsiṃ*, 3 sg. *viramāsi*, Geiger) and AMg. (*vayāsī*, °*si*, to *vayai* = *vadati*, Pischel).

32.50. Our language, indeed, goes farther than Pali or AMg. (as far as recorded in Geiger and Pischel), and forms aorists in *asi* to thematic presents, with unlengthened thematic vowel. Tho virtually limited to Mv among our

texts, these are numerous enough in prose as well as verses to be subject to no doubt. They may even be augmented: *adhyabhāṣasi* 'he addressed', *avacasi* 'he said' (cf. thematic aorist *avaca*, § 32.113 = Pali id.; these *asi* forms very probably started with affixation of *-si* to *avaca* and the like, just as *addaśāsi* etc. were based on *addaśā* etc.). To this extent, the *s*-aorist endings transcend their usual bounds and are added to short *a*.

32.51. The principal other pattern which was indefinitely productive in the Pkt. underlying BHS was the type in which *si* was preceded by *e*. This type is also familiar in Pali and AMg. (Geiger 165.2; Pischel 516, e. g. *kahesī*). No doubt, as Geiger says, it started with such forms as *(a)nesi* = Skt. *anaiṣīt*. Since this was associated with a MIndic present *neti* (= *nayati*), it became possible for any present in *aya* (*e*) to form such aorists; so we have e. g. *aśesi*, *praṇidhesi*, *ārocesi*, *āmantresi*, etc. The MIndic character of these forms is shown by the fact that the *s* is almost always dental, very rarely *ṣ*. And since our language, like Pali and Pkt., uses present stems in *e* in what are in Skt. normal *a*-stems, we also find such aorists as *vadesi*, *bhavesi* (to *bhavati*), *upapadyesi* (to *upapadyate*), etc.

32.52. In all these (and other) aorist formations, originally 3 sg. endings are freely used with subjects of other persons and numbers.

32.53. Type āsi (āsīt). This type started from Skt. forms like *ajñāsīt*, *ayāsīt*. With *-si* for *sīt*, and with or without augment, they occur: *ājñāsi* Mv iii.48.19 (prose), repeated 49.6 with regular Skt. *ājñāsīt* or *aj°*. In iii.386.18 (vs; 1 sg.) mss. *anyāsi*, representing dialectic pronunciation; Senart *ajñāsi*, but probably *ā-jñā* is the root concerned (cf. Pali *aññātaṃ* = *ājñātaṃ* Sn 699); *abhijñāsi* Mv i.4.7, 9 (prose). — *prāyāsi* Mv iii.437.16 (prose; augmented); *prayāsi* i.255.3 (prose) etc.; *niryāsi* i.216.19 (prose) etc.; *abhiyāsi* ii.411.10 (vs).

32.54. Similar forms which have no correspondents in normal Skt. literature: *asthāsi* SP 86.4 (vs); Mv i.55.5 (prose, 3 pl.); 245.12 (prose); 327.9 (prose, 1 sg.); ii.137.2 (prose), etc.; *utthāsi* Mv ii.232.16 (vs; em. but very probable); *pratyasthāsi* Mv i.55.15 (so with v.l.) = 56.10; iii.44.2 (prose, v.l. *pratyusthāsi*); ii.431.2 (prose), etc.; *pratyusthāsi* (! for *pratyutthāsi*? cf. iii.44.2 above) ii.444.7 (prose); *adhiṣṭhāsi* iii.53.15 (prose). — *ākhyāsi* Mv i.9.6; 10.18; 14.4 (all vss), etc.; *samākhyāsi* iii.87.16 (vs). — *adāsi* Mv i.37.12; 54.3 (both prose), etc.; 53.2 (prose, 1 sg.; subject *ahaṃ*, not equal to *ayaṃ* as Senart says; Buddha speaks of his previous existences in 1st person); *anupradāsi* iii.159.8 (prose). — *agāsi* 'sang' Mv i.130.6 (prose); Chap. 43, s.v. 2 *gā*. — *prabhāsi* Mv ii.345.8; 346.22 (vss) (or to *pra-bhās*, ending *-i*?).

32.55. And the like with normal Skt. ending: *adāsīt* SP 250.2 (prose, no v.l.); *samavāsthāsīt* probably to be read with Kashgar rec. for *samavātiṣṭhat* (both edd.) SP 239.3 (prose).

32.56. Like Pali and AMg., our language has *(a)kāsi* for Skt. *akārṣīt*, from *kṛ* (§ 32.49) Instead of *s* the mss. often write *ś*; this is ignored here. All but one of the following are in verses: *akāsi* Mv i.242.12; 262.8; 338.4 (by em.), 6, 8, 10 (the last is prose); iii.139.11; 400.15; 444.18; *kāsi* i.267.16; 278.11; iii.106.18; 380.18; with 3 pl. subject i.267.21. Cf. § 32.74 for *(a)kārṣi*, *(a)karṣīt*, etc.

32.57. Corresponding to Pali *addasāsi* (§ 32.49), from *dṛś*, we find *addaśāsi* or *addṛśāsi* (sometimes written with single *d*, but where meter is conclusive always pronounced with *dd*): *addaśāsi*, 3 sg., Mv i.237.7 (prose; by em.); 305.21 (vs); ii.91.19 (vs); 104.8 (vs, mss. *addarśāsi*; meter confused but seems to favor *addaśāsi*); 396.5 (vs); *addṛśāsi* (often written *adṛ°*), as 2 sg., LV 195.11, 15, 19 (vss); 3 sg., LV 196.12, 15, 19 (vss; here we seem to have general statements or predictions, as if for pres. or fut., cf. §§ 32.119 ff.); Mv ii.198.5; 396.1 (vss, in both mss. *śāmi*, but 3 sg.).

32.58. This ending may, of course, be 2 sg. historically, as well as 3 sg., and is actually so used in LV. As 2 sg. it was evidently assimilated to 2 sg. presents in *si*; and so by analogy were created *a(d)dṛśāti*, 3 sg., LV 75.6; 194.20; 197.9; 241.10, and *addaśāmi*, 1 sg., but in the first passage definitely past in meaning, Mv i.318.1 (prose); iii.385.19 (vs). The latter occurs also in Pali as *addasāmi* (Geiger 162.3; here without being properly related to *addasāsi* 165).

32.59. Like Pali, our language as we saw (§ 32.49) has *agamāsi*, based on *agama(t)* like *addaśāsi*: Mv iii.12.2, 13 (vs); 79.17 (vs; 3 pl.; Senart wrongly em. *agamāsu*); and *upagamāsi* Mv iii.82.16 (vs); *udgamāsi* iii.246.8 (vs). And, by assimilation of such forms as *agama(t)* to thematic imperfects, we get forms in *āsi* to thematic presents: *bhaṇāsi* (to *bhaṇati*) Mv ii.221.7 (vs); *ūhasāsi*, probably to be read with Senart Mv i.221.20 = ii.24.7 (vs, see Dict. s.v. *ūhasati*); *āmantrayāsi* iii.204.2 (prose, v.l. *°yāmi*, Senart em. *°yesi*); *praviśāsi* (v.l. *°śāmi*, Senart em. *pradiśāsi*, wrongly) iii.390.10 (prose); and probably *upanayāsi* iii.429.14 (vs, so Senart m.c., mss. *°yasi*).

32.60. Another blend form seems to be *udapāsi* 'originated, was produced', apparently based on *ud-apādi*, normal Skt. 3 sg. aor. passive (also in Mv i.47.13; 48.18) with adaptation to aorists in *āsi*. It occurs repeatedly in mss. of Mv, sometimes written *udupāsi* in one or both mss. In both i.237.14 and 16 Senart *udapāsi*, mss. in 14 *udupāsi*; text has *udapāsi* in i.248.7 (prose); 351.14 (prose); 352.5 (prose); ii.130.18 (mss. *udu°*); in ii.257.13 (prose) *udapādi*, but in repetition 258.11 *udapāsi* (no v.l.); also iii.50.19 (prose, v.l. *udupāsi*); iii.110.20; 194.1; 332.19; 333.1, 2; 407.16; 416.11; 417.9; 437.6; 440.19; 451.3 (in some of these one ms., in two both mss., *udupāsi*).

32.61. Equally anomalous, but isolated, is the form *kṛtāsi*, SP 51.6 (vs), discussed JAOS 57.31. It is confirmed by the quotation of the passage in Śikṣ 93.8; WT's emendation *kṛtāvi*, implausible anyhow, must be rejected, and even the Kashgar rec. *ca ālikhinsu* may be only an old lectio facilior. It is certainly a past form, with 3 pl. subject, adapted to the numerous forms in *āsi*. I suggested l. c. that it is based on a 3 sg. middle *(a)kṛta*, which would be in MIndic *(a)kata*, or *(a)katha* (in accord with the frequent Pali forms like *ajāyatha*, Geiger 161). A few forms of this sort, with the Pali form of the ending, occur in our language (§ 32.117); and cf. *pratyudgatāsuḥ* or (more probably) *°tānsuḥ*, § 32.77. I now wonder whether forms like *kṛtāsi*, *gatā(n)suḥ* may be based on the stem of the past passive participle. The Pkt. of the 'Kharoṣṭhī Documents' (Burrow § 105 ff.) has such preterites, but none, apparently, with *s*-aorist endings (rather, present endings).

32.62. Finally, there are even more numerous cases of aorists in *asi* (§ 32.50) from thematic presents. One of these is really based on a quasi-thematic aorist (*avaca*): *avacasi* 'said', 3 sg., Mv iii.386.11 (vs; Senart em. *°āsi*, but better meter as mss.). That 3 sg. pasts, not 2 sg. presents, are intended is clear from the sense, and is confirmed by occasional use of the augment, in *avacasi*, and in *adhyabhāṣasi* Mv i.55.6; ii.78.20 (both prose; these are 3d person forms, hence not augmented presents). Others: *anusmarasi* 'remembered' Mv i.4.8 (prose; parallel with preceding and following *abhijñāsi*); *ārocayasi* i.27.11–12 (prose); *paryadhigacchasi* 188.3 (vs); *āmantrayasi* 'said' 330.11; iii.160.14, 19; 441.19 (here v.l. *°yesi*; all prose); perhaps *kārayasi* ii.64.15 (prose, Senart with v.l. *°yesi*); *āgacchasi*, 1 sg., 'I came' ii.133.4 (prose); *abhisarasi* 'he went' ii.198.4 (so mss., better meter than Senart's em. *°resi*, which however is read in 14 below without v.l.); *budhyasi* 'he became enlightened' ii.336.15 (vs; four lines below *budhyansu*, 3 pl.); *dharasi* ii.356.9 (vs, v.l. *°sī*; 3 pl.);

antarahāyasi iii.316.10 (prose, 3 pl.; Senart em. °*hāyensu*). In Gv 259.23 (vs) *sūtraṃ nigarjasu narendraḥ*, 'the king proclaimed (to me) a sūtra', a 3 sg. aorist is certainly intended; read *nigarjasi*?

32.63. Type esi (esī, eṣīt). On this cf. § 32.51. The sibilant is usually written *s*; but note *kīrteṣu* (*atītān*, as separate word, = Tib. ḥdas pa, cf. Mvy 8304; so divide with WT) SP 63.9 and *parigraheṣīd* (?) SP 204.8; *janeṣī* LV 91.21; 92.4 (wrongly translated by Foucaux as if present with future meaning). The final *i* is almost always short; *ī* m.c. in e. g. LV 91.21; 92.4 *janeṣī*; 169.3 *thapesī*. There are few forms which could be regarded as inheritances from Skt.; indeed hardly more than (*a*)*nesi* (cf. Skt. *anaiṣīt*), in *vinesi* Mv i.297.13; 312.10; iii.235.8, etc., *ānesi* id. iii.169.21; *udānesi* ii.286.1; iii.162.7. Doubtful is *parigraheṣīd* SP 204.8 (vs), for which WT read *parigrahīṣīd* with their ms. K' (except that it has corruptly °*gṛhīṣīd*), which is confirmed by a ms. note of Burnouf, of which I have seen a photostat, quoting the reading *pratigrahīṣī* (cf. § 32.71). Pali has *aggahī* and *aggahesi*; should we read -*grahīṣī*(*d*) and regard it as a blend of these two MIndic forms? But even if -*graheṣīd* is the true reading (and in any case *praty-agrahesi* is found Mv ii.38.2; 105.6), it is very doubtful whether it really is an inheritance from the Skt. aorist formation represented by *agrahaiṣam* of AB (Whitney, Roots). It seems more plausible to take it, and the equivalent Pali *aggahesi*, as MIndic creations based on the presents (Pali) *gahāyati*, *gaheti*, our **graheti* (§ 35.19), as in the following cases.

32.64. Any verb with Skt. or MIndic present in -*e*(*ti*, -*te*), or Skt. -*aya*(*ti*), -*āya*(*ti*, -*te*), is likely to form an aorist in -*esi*, most commonly 3 sg. but good for all persons and numbers. The majority are like the Skt. 10th class, chiefly causatives and denominatives; but other types occur, as: *śesi* (vv.ll. *aśeśi*, *asesi*) 'lay', so read twice in Mv ii.86.8 (vs); to *śeti* (Pali aor. *sesi*); *praṇidhesi* (read °*sī*, m.c., cf. readings of mss. CM in 42.6 where mss. are corrupt) Mv i.42.6 = 53.3 = 336.19 (vs); i.49.16 (prose), etc.; *anupraṇidhesi* i.335.11 (prose); to present (*anu*)*praṇidheti*, § 28.48; *utthesi* Mv ii.349.6 = iii.273.5 (vs), to *uttheti*.

32.65. Examples based on presents of the 10th class type are: *kīrteṣu* (*atītān*, § 32.63; 2 sg., but clearly past, not = *kīrtayasi*) SP 63.9 (vs); *thapesī* (v.l. *stha*°) 'thou didst set', (2 sg., *ī* m.c.) LV 169.3 (vs). The rest all from Mv, prose except those marked (vs): *utpādesi* i.38.10; 44.13; 60.2; *niryātesi* i.49.16; 52.14; *ārocesi* i.257.15 (3 pl.); *pīḍesi* ii.175.13, 17 (vs; 2 sg., 'thou didst press'; = Pali *pīḷesi*, same vs, Jāt. iii.62.9); *nirṇāmesi* i.228.12; *dhāresi* i.265.15 (vs); iii.175.9 (so with mss. for Senart *vār*°); *āmantresi* i.51.8; 267.10; 324.8; iii.107.2, etc.; *kāresi* i.304.12, 13 (vss), etc.; *adhivāsesi* i.329.8; *āsvādesi* i.339.10; *jalpesi* 'caused to say', to **jalpayati*, ii.165.3; *visrambhesi* ii.242.15 (v.l. °*eti*); *citrīkāresi* (Senart em. wrongly *citti*°) ii.268.11; *vilokesi* ii.281.3, 4 (four times, all em. to °*eti* by Senart!); *vijṛmbhesi* ii.281.9, 10, 11 (5 times, all em. to °*eti* by Senart); *udānesi* ii.286.1; iii.162.7; *prakampesi* 'caused to tremble' ii.300.15; *atināmesi* ii.348.16; *kalpesi* iii.42.12; *prasādesi* 56.1; *tāresi* 77.13 (vs, 1 sg., 'I rescued'); *tarpesi* 249.4 (vs, 1 sg.); *āṇapesi* 299.9 (vs); *āchādesi* 301.3; *vitināmesi* 302.21; 303.2; *yojāpesi* 442.2; *kārāpesi* 442.3; *parimocesi* 446.2 (vs); *kathesi* 461.7.

32.66. But *esi* is also added to present stems in thematic *a* or at least to such as do not normally end in -*e*; this is doubtless part of the MIndic spread of *e*-stem verbs at the expense of *a*-stems (§§ 38.18 ff.). Particularly important are occasional forms in -*ayesi* from *aya*-presents, since here *e* cannot possibly stand for *aya*: Mv i.60.1 *mānayesi pūjayesi apacāyesi* (so probably read with v.l., Senart *mānesi pūjesi apa*°); i.49.10, 13 *kārayesi*; 247.6 *saṃmīlayesi* (vs; 1 sg.); ii.284.7 *abhinirnāmayesi* (v.l. °*etsi*; repeats 283.14 where °*nāmaye*); iii.106.2 (vs) *prasādayesi*; iii.428.10 *vinayesi*; ii.233.9 *dhārayesi*, *kalpayesi* (but 234.10 *dhāresi*, *kalpesi*).

32.67. Others (all Mv; but stems in -*e*- are otherwise found from a number of them): *upāgamesi* (in 1.4.3 *upāgami*, same mg.; but cf. Chap. 43, s.v. *gam* 3) i.4.2; 246.14 (vs); *okiresi adhyokiresi prakiresi* (but pres. -*kireti*) 38.9 f.; *upapadyesi* 45.10 (3 sg.! cf. § 38.21; Senart wrongly em. °*yāmi*); *viharesi* (there is also a pres. -*hareti*) 228.4, 6, 10; *abhinirharesi* 228.12; *vartesi* (not caus.) 268.17; *kampesi* (intrans.) ii.33.18 (vs); *vrajesi* 52.21 (vs, 2 sg.); 86.8 (vs); *abhiprasaresi* 104.6 (vs); *abhisaresi* 198.14 (vs); *āharesi* 233.8; 234.9; *ācamesi* 299.11 (vs); *smaresi* 300.12; 415.13 (vss); *bhavesi* 350.3; *yācesi* iii.97.15 (vs); *bhuṃjesi*, *haresi* 129.8; *pravrajesi* 172.16; *okiresi* (1 sg.) 248.6 (vs); *saṃsthihesi*, v.l. °*sthahaṃsi* (3 pl.; Senart em. °*sthihaṃsu*; same line ii.351.20 *saṃsthihetsu*) iii.276.1 (vs); *ujjhesi* (2 sg., perhaps present? v.l. in 9 *ujhyasi*) iii.295.7, 9.

32.68. Finally, the mss. at Mv ii.169.9 (prose) present *ārocatesi*, 3 sg.; if correct this would be a blend-form, 3 sg. pres. *ārocate* + aor. ending *si*; Senart em. *ārocayesi*.

32.69. Other si (sīt, etc.) after long vowels. Directly inherited from Skt. *aśrauṣīt* are *aśroṣīt* LV 143.13; 300.11–12 (both prose); Mv i.323.14; ii.271.14; 281.17 (3 pl.); iii.24.17; 101.19; 160.12 (all prose), etc.; RP 45.20; 54.1 (both prose); *aśroṣī* Mv ii.272.3; 427.12; iii.101.15 (all prose, v.l. °*ṣīt*); *aśroṣi* Mv i.319.15 (prose); *pratyaśroṣi* Mv i.317.18 (prose, v.l. °*ṣīt*). There is also 3 pl. *aśroṣuḥ*, (Skt. *aśrauṣuḥ*) Mv i.258.21 (prose); and note *śṛṇūṣu* or *śṛṇotsu*(?), § 32.101.

32.70. Mv i.59.14 f., has, in the mss., *satkarosi gurukarosi*, 3 sg. past. If correct they are doubtless based on the present stem *karo*-, with the aor. ending -*si*. Senart em. °*resi*.

32.71. In Mv ii.54.4 (vs) occurs *abravīṣi* 'he said', a modification of *abravīt* by affixation of the ending *si*, regular after a long vowel. The v.l. *abravīmi* is of course a graphic corruption. Cf. *abravītsu* § 32.37. On the uncertain -*grahīṣī*(*d*), perhaps to be read in SP 204.8, see § 32.63; it would be based on the 'stem' *grahī*- as in the Skt. future, infinitive, etc.

32.72. The regular sigmatic aorist of root *bhū* in our dialect is *abhūṣi* (sometimes *abhūṣī*, *abhūṣīt*). As noted in JAOS 57.28 f., this is remarkable, for no such form seems to be recorded in any form of MIndic. (The Aśokan 1 sg. aor. *husaṃ* may possibly be called an exception, as for **abhūṣam*, perhaps also 3 pl. *husu*, for which however Girnar has *ahuṃsu* which resembles BHS *abhūnsuḥ*, § 32.108.) Pali has *ahosi* (and *ahesuṃ*), AMg. *ahesi*; these we should expect to appear as **abhoṣi* and **abheṣi* (or °*ī*, °*īt*), which have not been found (unless the anomalous *bhosiṣu* contains a bare trace of the former, see § 32.78). This is the more surprising because we should except parallelism with the future, which actually is *bheṣyati* (regularly) or *bhoṣyati* (rarely and doubtfully). Note that in the same verse Mv iii.373.22 has *abhūṣi*, while Pali Jāt. v.149.29 has *ahosi*. Note also that the sibilant is this time always *ṣ*. The form is doubtless to be explained by proportional analogy to *abhū*(*t*), on the model of such pairs as *adā*(*t*): *adāsi*. As to the vowel of the ending, it is clear that *i* is regular, in Mv prose (also in the Lüders fragment of SP, Hoernle MR 150 infra; no correspondent in SP ed.) and in verses everywhere. In Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 133–135, the Kashgar rec. of SP has (in prose) twice *abhūṣī* (for which Thomas would read °*ṣīt*) and four times *abhūṣīt*; three of these six cases are 3 pl.; SP ed. 327.2 to 328.5 has instead *abhūt* or *abhūvan*. Mv i.128.13 (prose) also has *abhūṣī* in most mss.; v.l. *abhūṣi*. In verses, where meter requires *ī*, *abhūṣī* occurs e. g. SP 383.11; Gv 254.10. Examples of *abhūṣi* in verses of SP (26.13 etc.) and LV (27.19 etc.) are listed JAOS 57.29. In Mv, including prose, they are common; a few, all from prose, are: i.3.13; 35.14; 36.1, 3,

9, 11, 12; as 1 sg., *ahaṃ . . . abhūṣi* i.45.3–4; 47.16; 62.18 etc.; dual, i.38.2; 3 pl., iii.334.10 (parallels read *abhūnsuḥ*). In verses, *abhūṣi* e. g. Jm (Appendix) 240.9; Suv 153.10; 3 pl., Mv ii.71.1; Suv 49.7.

32.73. Once, in Mv i.34.16 (prose), the mss. read *abhūṣita* (one inferior ms. °*ite*). Senart emends to *abhūṣīt*, but *abhūṣita* might be a blend of *abhūṣi* with the 3 sg. middle ending -*ta*, cf. § 32.42.

32.74. s-aorists from roots in r (ṛ). Besides the form *(a)kāsi* (§ 32.56) from *kṛ*, assimilated to the type *āsi*, we find various more or less MIndic forms from such roots which preserve *r*. Such a form as *vyākārṣi*, 2 sg. 'you have explained', Mv iii.401.10 (vs), could be normal Skt. -*akārṣīs* but for the Prakritized ending. We also find forms of this sort with shortened medial *a*. It is open to question (cf. JAOS 57.29–30) whether they are directly based on Skt. *akārṣīt, akārṣus* etc., with MIndic shortened *a* before consonant cluster (§ 3.34), or semi-Sanskritized forms based on MIndic *(a)kāsi* etc., influenced by forms in -*ar*- such as aorists *kari, vyākari, udāhariṣu* (e. g. LV 200.9; 393.12; 413.21) etc. The forms in question are *vyākarṣi* Mv iii.139.10 (prose; v.l. *vyākārṣīt*); *vyākarṣīt*, perhaps the true reading for corrupt *vyākarṣitaś* LV 39.19 (prose); *vyākariṣi*, with epenthetic *i*, doubtless intended by mss. *vyākarṣi* Mv ii.193.12 (vs; Senart em. *viyākarṣi*).— 3 pl. forms *vyākarṣu* (but Burnouf's ms. *vyākārṣu*) 'they predicted' SP 27.3 (vs); *karṣu* LV 368.12 (vs; so some mss.; Lefm. em. *kariṣu*, but *karṣu* is metrically possible; one long syllable replaces two shorts); *harṣur* LV 271.16 (vs). Also the blend-form *prāvarṣu* 'they rained' Suv 8.8 (prose), from *pra-vṛṣ*; instead of **prāvarṣiṣus, iṣ*-aor. (*avarṣīt* V.B., Whitney, Roots), by adaptation to forms like *karṣu, harṣu(r)*. There is finally a reading *vyākarṣa*, Mv iii.386.6 (vs), extremely doubtful both as regards the ms. tradition and as to construction; it seems most likely meant for a 2 sg. aorist; read *vyākarṣi*?

32.75. 3 pl. āsu(ḥ), ānsu(ḥ), aṃsu(ḥ), atsu etc. We find from roots in *ā* various forms descended from the Skt. 3 pl. *s*-aorist *āsus* (as in *(a)hāsus* from *hā*), often with intrusive nasal (written *n* or *ṃ*), or also *t* (§§ 32.97, 98), before the sibilant, after the analogy of the endings *iṃsu, insu, ensu, etsu* etc. This recalls Pali forms like *adaṃsu*, from *dā*, classed as *s*-aorists, Geiger 163 (actually, no doubt, analogical to *adā*, on the model of *iṣ*-aorists, 3 sg. *i* or *ī*: 3 pl. *iṃsu*). The mss. vary seemingly at random between *āsu, ānsu, āṃsu, ātsu*, and the same with final *uḥ*. The following are in prose except those marked vs: Mv i.56.12, mss. *asthāṃsu(ḥ)* or *(a)sthāsu*; so also iii.242.8 (vs); *asthāsu* i.238.3, v.l. °*ānsuḥ*; *asthānsu*, v.l. *asthātsuḥ* 238.4; *asthānsuḥ*, v.l. *asthātsuḥ* ii.39.2 (vs); 137.5; iii.283.15; *asthātsuḥ*, v.l. *asthāsi* (Senart em. *sthitāsuḥ*!) ii.287.5; *asthātsuḥ*, v.l. *asthāsuḥ* (Senart em. °*ānsuḥ*) iii.64.16; 323.6; *asthānsu*, v.l. °*suḥ* 91.15; *asthāsuḥ* (Senart em. *asthānsuḥ*) 179.5; *asthāṃsu*, v.l. *asthāsu* 242.8 (vs); *asthānsu*, v.l. *asthāsu* 244.10 (vs); *asthānsuḥ*, v.l. *asthāsuḥ* 315.10.— *nirvāsu* (mss., Senart *nirvāṃsu*) Mv i.197.6 (vs), repeated 357.8 as *nirvāṃsu* (no v.l.); *niryānsuḥ*, v.l. *niryāṃsuḥ* iii.161.14.

32.76. Probably on the basis of the same analogies (3 sg. *i*: 3 pl. *iṃsu, insu*, or *e*: *eṃsu, ensu, etsu* etc.), a few similar 3 pl. forms are found in *ansu(ḥ), aṃsu, atsu* etc., corresponding to 3 sg. forms in *a(t)*, historically imperfects or thematic aorists (or forms based upon these). So *lalatsuḥ* or *lalaṃsu* (mss.) Mv ii.162.5; *kurvansu* (v.l. °*vetsu*) Mv iii.294.11 (= *akurvan*); *avacaṃsu* Mv ii.233.17 (to *avaca* etc., § 32.113); *budhyansu* (v.l. °*tsu*) 'they became enlightened' Mv ii.336.19 (vs; cf. *budhyasi* 3 sg. four lines above); *pravādayatsu* Suv 8.8 (prose; the only v.l. is the obviously secondary *pravādayāmāsuḥ*; Nobel em. *prāvādayiṃsu*); *pratijāgraṃsu* (v.l. °*jāgṛsuḥ*) Mv i.259.3 (prose), from *pratijāgrati*, see Dict.; and from the same verb a strange form *pratijāgṛhansuḥ* Mv i.231.11 (prose), in which the *h* is wholly anomalous; Senart suggests analogical influence of *prati-grah* (which does not fit here in meaning), 'probably due to copyists'.

32.77. Apparently a blend with the ending *āsuḥ* or *ānsuḥ*, 3 pl. aor., added to a form in *ta*, is *pratyudgatāsuḥ* (Senart with 1 inferior ms.), or better *pratyudgatānsuḥ* (5 mss.) Mv i.35.5 (prose), 'they went to meet'. Senart i. note 400 takes it as a periphrastic perfect = °*gatā āsuḥ*. But the form was apparently -*ānsuḥ*; and further note *kṛtāsi*, § 32.61, which means 'made', not 'was made'. If *kṛtāsi* is based on *(a)kṛta, -gatā(n)suḥ* could also be based on a 3 sg. middle *(a)gata*, which actually exists in the Veda (Whitney, Roots), provided with the 3 pl. ending *ānsuḥ*. See, however, § 32.61, end. Senart reads in Mv i.222.12 (vs) *udgatāsuḥ*, which would be a form of the same sort; but it is uncertain. The mss. read *udgatesuḥ*; in the parallel ii.24.20 they read *udgametsuḥ*.

32.78. Miscellaneous s-aorists. In Sukh 7.13 (vs) *bhosiṣu* is probably corrupt; at best it might be a 3 pl. aorist of *bhū* based on **(a)bhosi* (not recorded! cf. § 32.72) = Pali *ahosi*, with addition of the 3 pl. -*su*.

32.79. In SP 468.7 (prose), a late passage, *akṣaipsīt* is read (from *kṣip*), a form cited by Hindu grammarians but not known in literature. Only three Nep. mss. have the word, and only one in this form (the others *akṣe*°, *akṣī*°), while the Kashgar rec. has *kṣipataḥ*, which is obscure to me.

32.80. LV 136.6 (vs) reads *pravekṣī*, from *viś*, which has no *s*-aor. in Skt.; if it existed it would be **avaikṣīt*. LV 379.18; 380.2 have *prākṣur*, to *spṛś*. LV 364.11 (vs) *dikṣiṣu* is not a form of *diś*; see Dict. s.v. *udikṣati*.

32.81. Very anomalous is *lapsi* SP 190.2, to *labh*. Whitney, Roots, mentions *alabdha, alapsata* B.; *lapsīya* S.; *lapsi* might pass for a form of this type, provided with the normal ending *i*. Has there been contamination with the desiderative *lipsate*, °*ti*?

32.82. From the same root occurs *abhilabdha* Mv ii.61.19 (vs; so with v.l., Senart *abhilabdhe* with one ms., unmetrical); *alabdha* (classed as 3 sg. mid. *s*-aor.) is found in older Skt. (B., Roots) and authorized by Paṇini; Pali also has *aladdha* (and *alattha*). Like the preceding would be *aviddha* Mv i.131.15 (prose), if Senart's em. is right; mss. *avidhvaṃ*; a 3 sg. from *vyadh* seems required.

32.83. AsP 112.17 (prose) has *pranaṅkṣīt*, from *naś* 'perish', which has no *s*-aorist in Skt. (Read *tāṃ* for the following *tvāṃ*.)

32.84. Several times in Mmk occurs a 2 pl. injunctive (augmentless aorist), *bhaiṣṭ(h)atha* or *bhaiṣṭata*, the equivalent of Skt. *bhaiṣṭa*; always with *mā*: 'fear not!' It seems to be an extension of *bhaiṣṭa* by duplication of the ending *ta*, or *tha* (which in our language as in Pali occurs commonly for Skt. 2 pl. *ta*). Most of the passages are prose, but in a verse Mmk 548.14 we find *mā bhaiṣṭhatha*, meter confirming the form. The others are *mā bhaiṣṭatu* (! read surely °*ta* or °*tha*, probably the former) *mārṣā mā bhaiṣṭatha* 4.14–15; *mā bhaiṣṭatha mārṣāḥ mā bhaiṣṭatha* 182.23; *mā bhaiṣṭata bhaginyaḥ mā bhaiṣṭatha* 520.28; *(mā) bhaiṣṭata mārṣā mā bhaiṣṭata* 663.10.

Optative forms used as aorists

32.85. As was recognized JAOS 57.32–33, and much earlier by Senart Mv i note p. 401, our language uses original optative forms, or forms identical with optatives, as aorists, or at least in the meaning of past indicatives. Especially common are forms in *e* (or not infrequently *et*), and 3 pl. *etsu(ḥ), ensu(ḥ)*, based on thematic presents, which in the Mv must be recognized as normal aorist forms. The form in *e*, and other apparent optative forms, in this sense also occur in AMg., as recognized by Pischel

466. Pischel noted, l.c. note 2, that *prabrūyāt* was used in the same way in the Hastyāyurveda. S. M. Katre (JAOS 57.316 f. and NIA 1.536) and I myself (Bull. Deccan Coll. Research Inst. 5.6; ed. of Mbh II, note in Addenda on 2.67.5d and 15d) have since observed *iyāt* (and *iyām*) as narrative pasts in the Skt. epic. There seems no doubt of the usage, tho it may be guessed that the (rare) occurrence of such forms in Epic and late Skt. may be due to MIndic influence. In any case many forms in *e*(*t*) in our language cannot possibly be interpreted except as pasts; they are even augmented sometimes: *adhy-abhāṣe* is very common in Mv. As usual they are not limited to 3 sg. subjects but may be used with any person and number. The distinctive 3 pl. forms written by Senart with ending *ensu*(*ḥ*) are almost always written *etsu*(*ḥ*) in the mss.; cf. Mv i, p. xvi. They are doubtless analogical to the form in *e*, like *i*: *insu* (*iṃsu, itsu*), § 32.98. Other optative forms occur as aorists more sporadically, but often enough to furnish important confirmation of this interpretation of the *e*-form.

32.86. Another consideration must, however, be mentioned in connexion with the preterite forms in -*e*(*t*), -*etsu*(*ḥ*) and the like. Since in our language, as in MIndic generally, *eti* presents may be substituted for *ati* presents, it is not impossible that these aorists are in part due to this (§ 38.19). Since *gacchayati* or *gaccheti* may replace *gacchati*, there is no theoretic objection to regarding (*a*)*gacche*(*t*) as a preterite to this, as if for (*a*)*gacchayat*. (Cf. the aorists in *esi* from presents in *ati*, §§ 32.64 ff.) This can hardly be the whole story, since other optatives are used as preterites. Further, at least in the Mv, aorists in *e*(*t*), *etsu*(*ḥ*) etc. are very much commoner than presents or other forms in *eti* substituted for *ati*; they are not likely all to be based on such *eti* presents.

32.87. The ending e(t) as preterite is rare except in the Mv, tho very common there. Elsewhere have been noted only *spṛśe ca bodhiṃ* 'and he attained enlightenment' SP 190.7 (vs); possibly *vyuttiṣṭhet* SP 182.13 (no v.l. in KN); but WT read *vyuttiṣṭhan*, stating that their ms. K′ reads so (the construction of a pres. pple. would be difficult, however); *snāpayet* Śikṣ 155.3 (quoted from Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka, a work composed in language closely resembling the Mv even in prose); (1 sg.) *yadā bhave* (taken by ed. as *yadābhave*, i. e. *abhave*) *sunetraḥ* RP 23.16 'when I was S.'; *deśayet* Gv 146.3, 10, 12 etc., in straight narrative prose.

32.88. In Mv there are hundreds of cases. I shall cite a few examples chiefly from prose, taking care to illustrate augmented forms, forms in final *t* or *d*, and forms used as other than 3 sg. Forms from verses are marked vs.

32.89. Augmented forms: *adhy-abhāṣe* i.78.2; 82.9; 108.6; 174.3, and often; *apreṣaye* (! note misplaced augment) 128.16; *abhāṣe* 267.12 (so read with one ms.); *abhyanande* ii.139.22 (3 pl.); 397.6; iii.337.8 (3 pl.); *alabhe* ii.166.4 (vs); iii.11.3 (vs, 2 sg., read *alabhe* with mss.); *agrahe* ii.181.20 (vs); *pratyabhāṣe* 235.8; 236.1; 237.1; *abhyabhāṣe* 404.22 (also *abhibhāṣe* iii.379.13); *akare* iii.45.18 (vs); *adhyagame* 191.4 (vs; in Pali *ajjhagamā* Jāt. iii.450.22, same vs); *adhyabhāṣaye* 327.5; *aghātaye* 360.17 (vs).

32.90. Forms ending in *t* or *d*: *abhipīḍayet* i.68.15 (vs); *avatiṣṭhet* 220.9 (vs) = *avatiṣṭhe* ii.22.10; *samanusmaret* i.228.16; *atyudgacchet* (Senart em. *abhy*°) i.229.16 = 333.7 = *atyudgame* 240.5; *parinirvāyet* 267.18 (vs, v.l. °*ye*); *anusmaret* 269.9 (vs, 1 sg.); 269.12 (vs, 2 sg.); *niṣkramet* 303.11 (vs); *praviśet* 307.16; *preṣayet* 329.12; *prajñapayet, abhināmayet, saṃtarpayet, saṃpravārayet* 325.8–11; *samudāgacchet* 339.7; *vinivartayed* ii.61.21 (vs); *kārāpayet* 116.1; 117.8, 10; *dhārāpayet* 117.5; *pūjayet* 119.3; *sthāpayet* 119.4; *utpadyet* 194.8 (vs); *vipravāsayet* iii.44.22 (vs); *prajñāpayed* 53.16 (1 sg.; v.l. *apra*°); *pṛcchet* 242.6 (vs).

32.91. 1 sg. (besides some above): *abhinigṛhṇe abhinipīḍe* ii.124.2; *uparundhe* (mss. °*ruddhe*) 125.1; *āhare* 125.10; *parivarjaye* (v.l. °*varje*) 131.7; *upapadye* 133.4; *prapate* iii.12.6, 17 (vss); *pratigṛhṇe* 54.13; *pibe* 174.12 (vs); *prastave* 248.4 (vs); *okire* 248.8 ff. (vss); *pratimāne* 248.12 (vs; to *pratimānayati*); *abhistave* 248.17 (vs); 400.18; *prastare* 249.2 (vs); *āchādaye* 249.6 (vs); *care* 249.7 (vs); *pṛcche* (v.l. *apṛcchaṃ*) 369.23 (vs); *jahe* 431.18 (vs).

32.92. 2 sg. (besides some above): *vinodaye* ii.186.20 (vs); *tarje* iii.32.5 (vs); *prasādaye* 106.8; *pravartaye* (mss. *varttaye*) 381.12 (vs); *jahe* 431.15 (vs); *kīrtaye* 441.7 (vs); *prakīrtaye* 441.12 (vs).

32.93. 3 pl. (besides some above): *paripṛcche* i.66.6 (vs); *pratigṛhṇe* 220.13 = ii.22.14 (vs); *saṃnipate* i.303.19 (vs); *dhāraye* ii.21.6 (vs; so with mss., subject *devasaṃghā*, object *bodhisattvam* understood); *bhāṣe* 300.11 (vs); *prāpuṇe* 302.21 (vs); *alaṃkare* 303.8 (vs); *name* 303.9 (vs); *abhistave* 309.3 (vs); 346.18 (vs); *vāye* 352.14 = iii.276.16 (vs); *avaśire, ośire,* or °*sire* (so with mss.) ii.343.19; iii.273.16; *pravarṣe* ii.344.5; *upāgame, lobhaye* 425.6; *saṃprakire* iii.94.20 ff. (vss); *saṃsare* 249.12 (subject *bodhisattvā*, with mss.); *abhinande* 335.9; *prakrame* 339.6.

32.94. 3 sg. (besides the above; a few of many cases): *utpādye* i.3.4 'was produced', to *utpādyate*, pass. of caus. (no 'confusion with *udapādi*' as suggested by Senart); *parikarmaye* (so with mss.) 3.12–13; *niṣīde* 4.6; *samanubudhye* 4.10; *kampe prakampe* 40.7; *atyudgame* (mss., Senart em. *abhyu*°) 240.5; *vijahe* 329.6; *antarahāye* 'disappeared' 339.18, etc.; *udānaye* 351.13; iii.325.5; *pratibhāye* ii.122.11; 123.8; *prasīde tiṣṭhe saṃpraskande* 157.13; *saṃdhihe* (so with mss., to **saṃdhihati*, § 28.44) 221.20 (vs; Senart em.); *saṃsthihe* (to °*sthihate*) 234.5; iii.65.6; 92.10, etc.; *ūhase* 'laughed' (see Dict.) ii.268.13 ff.; *anuprāpuṇe* iii.67.2, 4; *prāduṣkare* 139.1; *praṇude* 286.7 (vs, = Pali SN i.127.19 *panudī*); *kathe* (to *kathayati*, = next) 408.15; *kathaye* 413.2.

32.95. 3 pl. forms in eṣu, eṃsu, ensu, etsu(ḥ) etc. Corresponding to the above forms in *e*, AMg. has 3 pl. forms in *esu*, *eṃsu* (Pischel 516 *karesu* Sūyag. 790, for which Pischel would read *kariṃsu*; Ratnachandra I p. xxvi *kareṃsu* beside *kariṃsu*). In our language *eṣu* has been noted only once, *saṃjalpeṣu* Mv i.41.8 (prose), in a formulaic passage; repeated parallels read *saṃjānetsuḥ* (mss.) Mv i.230.3; 240.13; iii.334.11; 341.15; *saṃjānanti* SP 163.12, etc. More often *eṃsu* or *ensu* occurs (below); while the mss. of Mv (rarely of other texts) very commonly present *etsu*(*ḥ*), which Senart (see his Mv i p. xvi) invariably emends to *ensu*(*ḥ*). For the same form in optative formation see § 29.18.

32.96. Fuller information leads me to modify the view of these forms expressed in JAOS 57.26, as follows. The rather rare endings *eṣu* and *eṃsu*(*ḥ*) seem clearly analogical to *e*, on the pattern of 3 sg. *i* to 3 pl. *iṣu* and *iṃsu*, which are standard. As to *etsu*(*ḥ*), I cannot believe that the hundreds of occurrences in Mv are all manuscript corruptions, as Senart assumes. Why would copyists introduce secondarily such a monstrous-seeming form, in such a regular and constant way? We must apparently admit that the author of Mv actually used the form; and this is confirmed by a few occurrences of *etsu*(*ḥ*), and also of *itsu*(*ḥ*) and *atsu*(*ḥ*), in mss. of other texts (§§ 32.38, 76).

32.97. The explanation may be like that of the fut. *vihatsyase* (§ 31.24): *ensu*(*ḥ*) yielding **entsu*(*ḥ*), then *etsuḥ*; on the denasalization cf. Bloch, Indo-Aryen 88, and my § 2.67.

32.98. Alternatively, these aor. (opt.) forms (tho not *vihatsyase*) could be explained analogically. We saw that the Mv uses not only the MIndic *e* but *et*, the regular Skt. 3 sg. opt. form, as a past. In the semi-Sanskritized language which the northern Buddhists worked out for official use,

such forms evidently were well established. These forms in *et*, then, both in aorist and in optative function, might have been pluralized by addition of the 3 pl. *su*, on the pattern of *iṣu* to *i*. Similarly the mss. sometimes show *atsu* (§ 32.76; to thematic pasts in 3 sg. *at*) and *itsu* (analogical to *i* for *īt*; § 32.38; rare, and perhaps created after the establishment of *etsu* to *et*). Cf. *abravītsu* and perhaps *āsītsu*, § 32.37; *abhūtsuḥ* etc. § 32.108.

32.99. There is even one case where the mss. of Mv (i.306.15, āryā vs) show *etsuḥ* added bodily to the thematic preterite *avacat*. The mss. here read *te bhikṣu avacatetsuḥ* (v.l. °*su*), which is metrically correct and which I would not emend. (Senart em. *avacensuḥ*, which compels him to adopt the further em. *bhikṣū*, to correct the meter.)

32.100. The mss. vary apparently at random between final *-u* and *-uḥ*; often different mss. differ on this point in the same passage, in prose and verse alike. When in verses the meter requires a long final syllable, presumably *uḥ* or its saṃdhi equivalent should always be read; when the ultima should be short, we should read final *u*. In prose both are common, at least in the mss.

32.101. *eṃsu(ḥ)* and *ensu(ḥ)* are to be regarded as merely orthographic alternatives; the latter is regularly adopted by Senart instead of *etsu(ḥ)*. Outside of Mv we have noted LV 387.1 (vs) *sādheṃsu*, which to be sure is Lefmann's em. but seems sound; SP 52.12 (vs) *śruṇensu*, no v.l. in KN, but WT *śruṇiṃsu* with their ms. K'. Note that Śikṣ 94.12 cites the line from SP, reading *śṛṇūṣu*! (with v.l. *śṛṇotsu*!).

32.102. In the mss. of Mv, as distinguished from Senart's text, the form with *n* instead of *t* is rare. Both Senart's mss. apparently read *parivārensu(ḥ)* ii.225.10 (vs); but such cases are extremely scarce. Somewhat more often, but still relatively rarely, one ms. has *n* for *t*, as in *upagamensuḥ* i.224.6 (vs); *viśodhensuḥ* ii.199.3 (vs); *vilayensu* 282.15; *vādyensuḥ* 303.17; *addaśensuḥ* 344.19 (vs); *prādurbhavensu* iii.180.15 (prose, Senart em. °*ve*); *akarensu* iii.96.17 (vs); *anubandhensu* 96.22; 97.1 (vss); *saṃnipatensuḥ* 113.12 (prose); *karensu(ḥ)* 365.13 (vs); *gacchensu* 373.21 (vs); *prādurbhavensuḥ* 430.16 (prose). Or, one ms. has *vadansuḥ*, the other *vadetsu* i.307.6 (prose); and so mss. *saṃpravādyansu*, °*yetsu* iii.96.13, 15 (vss).

32.103. The ending *etsu(ḥ)* is rare outside of Mv; Suv 151.11 (vs) has in most mss. *samupādayetsuḥ* (Nobel °*yitsuḥ*, 'metrisch für *samutpā°*'). We shall present a few out of the very many Mv cases, all chosen from prose. They are, of course, normally based on thematic presents; sometimes from *aya* presents, with or without preservation of the syllable *-ay-* (but there is certainly, in most cases, no correlation between this element and the *e* of the penult in these forms). Mv i.37.1, 3; 39.4 *manyetsuḥ*; 40.11, 16 *udīrayetsuḥ*, *anuśrāvayetsuḥ* (repeated passim, with slight vv.ll., sometimes °*tsu* for °*tsuḥ*, e. g. 229.12; 239.20; 336.13); 42.1–3 *prapatetsuḥ* (thrice); 52.3 *tiṣṭhetsuḥ* (v.l. °*atsuḥ*); 57.10 ff. *vyākaretsuḥ*; 80.1 (twice) *vivartetsu*, v.l. °*suḥ*; 194.17 *krīḍetsu rametsu paricāretsu* (cf. mss. iii.227.4); 231.2 *antarhāyetsu*, or *antarahāyetsuḥ*; 259.12 *pratyudgacchetsu* or °*tsuḥ*; 328.5, 6 *adṛśetsu*, and *addaśetsu* (in same sentence! v.l. °*tsuḥ* for both; cf. § 32.25); 337.2 *śruṇetsu* or °*tsuḥ*; 344.4 ff. *prajñāyetsu* (several times, sometimes v.l. °*tsuḥ*; passive); 339.15, 16; 340.8, 9; 341.2 (twice) *āhāretsu* or *āhar°*, or °*tsuḥ*; 342.11–13 *saṃrañjetsu(ḥ)*, *dūṣayetsuḥ*, *paśyetsu(ḥ)*, *kṣipetsu(ḥ)* (thrice); ii.133.12 *abhyanandetsuḥ* (augmented); 161.1 *gāyetsu*; 215.10; iii.312.13 *akaretsuḥ*; ii.312.7 ff. *addaśetsuḥ*, *daśetsuḥ* (repeatedly, cf. *adṛśetsu* above); iii.69.16 *addaśetsuḥ*; 409.9 *paricumbetsuḥ rodetsuḥ krandetsuḥ śocetsuḥ paridevetsuḥ*.

32.104. In a few rare cases these forms seem to be based on other than thematic presents or thematic pasts (like *adṛśetsu*, *addaśetsu(ḥ)* above). Thus Mv iii.305.6 (vs) *adetsuḥ* 'they gave', to *deti* 'gives'; and perhaps Mv iii.85.5 (vs) *samākhyetsu* 'they said', to *samākhyāti*, *°*khyati* (analogous to *-khyāmi*? but v.l. *samākhyāsu* may be the true reading, cf. § 32.75).

32.105. Miscellaneous optative forms used as aorists, or at any rate with the meaning of past indicatives. Once augmented.

1 sg. *eyaṃ*: *udvīkṣeyaṃ* Mv ii.194.6 (vs).

3 sg. *eya*: *prādurbhaveya* 'appeared' Mv i.340.12 (prose); *ādiyeya* Mv i.346.11 (prose; to *ādiyati*, Dict.); *āhaneya* Mv ii.412.19 (vs); *kampeya* Mv ii.413.1 (vs, meter obscure; Senart em. *kampe*).

3 sg. *īya* (?), apparently equivalent to the form *īa* which is authorized by the grammarians in the meaning of a past in AMg. (*acchīa*, etc.). Pischel 466 treats these forms as historically opt., quoting Lassen who described them as precatives. I do not see how they can be directly derived from any Skt. opt. or precative, unless from such 9th class pres. optatives as *gṛhṇīyāt*, where the *ī* is part of the present stem. They seem to occur twice in Mv i.304.9 (vs) *upasthīya* (v.l. °*yaṃ*), 'waited upon', to *upasthā* (based on the pres. *sthāti*? § 28.51); and *pṛcchīya* iii.85.2 (vs) *so tāṃ* (= *tān*) *pṛcchīya medhāvī*, 'he, the wise, asked them;' this is certainly based on the thematic present *pṛcchati*. Doubtful.

1 pl. *ema*: *āharema* Mv. i.344.15 (prose, v.l. *āhareyāmā*); *tiṣṭhema* Mv i.345.5, 14 (prose).

3 pl. *eyuḥ*: *upasaṃkrameyuḥ* Mv i.36.8 (prose); and repeatedly in Mmk, e. g. 130.19, 26 *bhaveyuḥ*, 23 *āgaccheyur* (all prose).

3 pl. (mid.) *eran*: *adhyabhāṣeran* 'they addressed' Mv i.56.13 (prose; no important v.l.).

3 sg. (mid.) *īta*, from an *aya* stem (see § 29.6): *vilakṣayīta* 'was observed' SP 193.9 (vs).

Relatives of the Skt. root aorist

32.106. Occasionally root aorist forms from roots in *ā* occur with MIndic loss of the consonant of the ending. So Mv i.55.15 (prose) *pratyasthā*, for °*āt*; so Senart with 2 mss.; v.l. °*sthāsi*, § 32.54, which is read in the same phrase 56.10, while in 55.2–3 the regular Skt. °*sthāt* is read. In Mv ii.315.10 *samayā* seems to stand for °*ayāt*, tho the meaning seems to be optative, 'would come together'; Senart em. *samaye*, against both mss. In Mv iii.457.15 (vs) *anvagā*, 1 sg., from *anu-gā*; repeated several times, the mss. sometimes showing v.l. °*gāḥ* (457.20) or °*gāt* (458.6, still 1 sg.); in the same verse Pali *anvagā* Jāt. v.258.25.

32.107. The Skt. *abhūt*, in that form, is (as usual) used for other persons and numbers: 1 sg. SP 22.11 (prose); LV 239.18 (prose); Kv 24.18 (prose); 2 sg. SP 64.11 (prose); 3 pl. SP 46.5; LV 74.15; 138.3; 164.1; Mv ii.231.13 (all vss). Often it appears in MIndic form, lacking the final *t*: *abhū* as 3 sg. even before a vowel SP 157.10 (vs) and Mv iii.360.16 (vs), and otherwise Mv i.114.8 (vs); 116.17 (vs); 341.6 (prose); as 2 sg. LV 165.13, 17, 21; 166.3, 7, 11, 15; 170.19; as 1 pl. (subject *vayaṃ*) LV 252.11; as 3 pl. (sometimes before vowel) Mv ii.91.14; 316.18; 352.5; iii.276.5, 7 (all vss). Also with shortening of the vowel m.c., in verses, *abhu* SP 204.9 (before vowel); LV 237.14; Mv ii.343.4; Gv 285.10; Samādh 8.26, 31. MIndic *h* for *bh* is rare, but *ahū* occurs Gv 254.23, as 1 sg., 'I was'. The Skt. 1 sg. *abhūvam* becomes *abhūva* in a vs, m.c.: RP 25.15.

32.108. A 3 pl. to *abhū(t)*, *abhu*, occurs often in Mv, written *abhūnsu(ḥ)*, *abhūtsu(ḥ)*, *abhunsu(ḥ)*, °*tsuḥ*, *abhuṃsu(ḥ)*; cf. Aśokan *ahuṃsu*, Hultzsch lxviii, 'based on the 3 sing. *ahu* (= Skt. *abhūt*), as Pali *āsiṃsu* on *āsi* (= Skt. *āsīt*)'. As to the variant with *t* for the nasal, cf. §§ 32.38, 96–98. The mss. often vary between these orthographies; Mv i.41.7 (prose) *abhunsuḥ* (v.l. °*tsuḥ*, °*ṃsu*), in parallels 230.2; 240.12; iii.341.14 variants *abhūnsuḥ*, °*tsuḥ*; i.41.10

abhunsuḥ (mss. mostly °*ṃsuḥ*), in parallels 230.5; 240.14; iii.334.12; 341.17 varr. *abhūnsu(ḥ)*; i.41.12 *abhunsuḥ* (varr. °*ṃsu*, °*ṃsuḥ*, °*tsuḥ*), in parallels 230.7; 240.16 *abhūnsuḥ*; i.195.11–196.7, about 10 times, mostly *abhunsuḥ*, some *abhūnsuḥ*, variants with *ṃ* and once *t* for *n*; i.248.9 *abhūnsuḥ*, 12 *abhunsuḥ*, 14 *abhunsu* (v.l. °*suḥ*), 19 *abhunsuḥ* (all prose); 249.8, 9, 11, 13 *abhūnsuḥ*, *abhunsu(ḥ)* with varr. °*ṃsuḥ*, °*tsuḥ*; 340.8 *abhūnsu*; 9 *abhūtsuḥ* (so mss., both prose); *abhūnsuḥ* in prose without v.l. ii.125.12, 13; 126.18; 129.8; 162.14, 16; 163.8, 19; *abhūtsuḥ* mss. in iii.199.12, prose, no v.l. And so forth.

32.109. Either to this or the next section (thematic aor.) belong one or two borderline forms from the root *bhū*. LV 83.13 (prose) has *abhūvatāṃ*, 3 dual, for Skt. *abhūtāṃ*. Weller 52 would read *abhuvatāṃ*, connecting it with the Pali (thematic) *ahuvā* (Geiger 162.2), = Vedic *abhuvat*; cf. AMg. *bhuvi(ṃ)*, Pischel 516. I would not emend; but the form may be a blend of the Skt. root-aorist with the MIndic thematic past. In LV 222.11 and 21 (vss) *bhuv' (imu)* is read by Lefm. with mss. (vv.ll. *bhuvisu*, °*ṣu*) at 21; in 11 mss. all *bhū-* (varying as to what follows) but this is metrically impossible. We must understand a 3 sg. past, perhaps *(a)bhuv(at)* = Pali *ahuvā*. Divy 402.22 (vs), mss. *ahaṃ tadābhuvan*, contains a 1 sg. *abhuvam*, either m.c. for Skt. *abhūvam*, or a 1 sg. to Vedic *abhuvat* = Pali *ahuvā*. (The ed. emends to *abhavam*.)

Relatives of Skt. thematic aorists (and imperfects)

32.110. 3 sg. a, ā. Here belong forms of the roots *dṛś*, *vac*, and *gam*, historically thematic aorists. In general they correspond to the Pali forms *addasā*, *agamā*, and *avaca*, *avoca* (Geiger 159.II; 162.3, 4). I have hardly noted them outside of Mv, and there (strangely) only in verses. MSV has one prose instance.

32.111. The first is rare: Mv i.9.3 *addasā* (so Senart with one ms.), or better *addaśā* (2 mss. *addaśāṃ*, 3 mss. *adṛśā*; meter requires *-dd-*, but long *ā* is not required). In Mv ii.186.8 and 14 *addarśā*, with full-grade root syllable as in *ad(d)arśi* etc., § 32.27; here the meter is indifferent as to quantity of all the syllables. For *(ad)dṛśi* and the like see § 32.25.

32.112. From *gam*, as in Pali (ultimately = Skt. *agamat*), we find as 3 sg. *agamā* Mv i.220.10 = ii.22.11; as 1 sg. *agamā* iii.12.5, 16 (so, or *āgamā*, one ms., the other *agamo* or *āg*°; Senart em. *agamaṃ*); and as 3 pl., acc. to mss., *agamo* iii.88.5 (vs); Senart em. *agamu* (presumably supposing equivalence to Skt. *-uḥ*, but a more likely em. would be *agamā*, cf. the preceding where *agamo* is v.l. for *agamā*); also 3 pl. *upāgamā* ii.53.19 (vs), so read with 1 ms., v.l. *upāgame*; reading confirmed by same vs in Pali Jāt. v.393.4 *athāgamā* (Senart em. °*gatā*); *āgamā(ḥ* ? before *y-*), 2 sg., MSV i.43.5 (prose).

32.113. Commoner are the forms of *vac*, especially *avaca* (see Chap. 43), as in Pali. It is used as 3 sg. Mv i.143.11 = ii.4.4; ii.6.12 (parallel i.202.15 *avaci*, on which see § 32.24); i.225.18 = ii.28.19; i.304.6; ii.12.3 (parallel i.207.13 *avaci*); ii.29.11; 61.15; 134.15; 205.5 (Senart em. *avacā* m.c.); 222.9; 227.16; 228.16; 230.5; 327.18; 333.21; 340.4; iii.105.1, 3; 134.18; 270.16; 294.16; 355.15; as 2 sg. iii.17.14; as 3 pl. i.218.1 = ii.19.20; ii.221.9; 226.11; 228.14. (On the corresponding 3 pl. *avacaṃsu* see § 32.76.) —Senart reads *avacat* with one ms. ii.27.1 (v.l. *avaca*); in the parallel i.224.1 mss. *avaca*, Senart em. *uvāca*. In ii.71.5 the mss. have *avacati*, perhaps for *avaca* with the 3 sg. present ending (cf. *avacasi* 3 sg., § 32.62; *addṛśāti*, *addaśāmi*, § 32.58), unless *-ti* represents *iti*, which is possible; Senart emends to *avaca*. And finally ii.330.5 has, according to the text, *avāca*, without v.l.; misprint for *uvāca*? Or for *avaca* with *ā* m.c.? (But the meter is confused and obscure.)

32.114. As in Pali, the regular Skt. *avocat* is inherited and appears as *avoca* Mv ii.37.12; same as 3 pl. ii.204.14.

32.115. Also a number of (almost always) unaugmented thematic imperfects with MIndic ending *a* for *at* (sometimes *ā*, perhaps only m.c.), or occasionally for *as*, 2 sg., or *an*, 3 pl.: LV 166.5 (vs) *hata bhava* (= *abhavas*), 'thou wast struck'; 185.11 (vs), read *abhistuva* (metr. correct; § 28.7) for text *abhivusta*, Corrigenda *abhitustuvu* (but a 3 sg. is required; mss. vary greatly but suggest *-stuva*); 297.8 (vs) *upadarśaya*, 3 pl., 'pointed to (the Bodhisattva)'; 308.12 (vs) *gaccha* (= *agacchat*); Mv ii.205.6 (vs) *parikīrtaya* (= *paryakīrtayat*); Dbh.g. 18(354).8 *abhikira*, 3 pl. (= *abhyakiran*); *diśa* (= *adiśat*) LV 391.21.

32.116. Less numerous are such forms in *ā*, possibly only m.c. for *a* (but cf. *addaśā*, *agamā* etc. above): *sampratīcchā*, with 3 dual subject (some mss. °*ccha*, unmetrical) LV 92.13 (vs); *saṃprayacchā* (but this is an em., all mss. corrupt) 197.11 (end of vs).—In Mv i.182.16 (vs), read *amantrayā* 'he announced', with 4 mss. (one *amantreyā*; Senart em. °*traye*); here augmented.

32.117. 3 sg. (pl.) atha. The ending *(a)tha*, recognized in Pali and there classed as 3 sg. middle in origin (Geiger 158, 159.II), occurs sporadically, tho apparently only with 3 pl. subjects, and only in verses of Mv: i.176.17 *lipyatha* 'were stained', to *lipyate*; *nilīyathā* i.219.3 = *(a)bhilīyathā* ii.21.5 'they flew down, flew thither' (so mss., at end of line; no metrical reason for final *ā*; Senart em. °*tha*, °*ta*). Cf. §§ 32.41, 42.

32.118. 3 pl. As we have seen, imperfect and aorist forms are not clearly differentiated in our language, any more than in Pali (Geiger 158, 159.II, IV). Pali has *uṃ*, corresponding to Skt. *uḥ*, in 3 pl. past forms generally (so far as they do not end in *-ṃsu*). Similarly our language occasionally substitutes *uḥ*, or (m.c.) *u*, for *an*, 3 pl. thematic impf. or aor. So LV 27.22 (vs) *adṛsu* (*cādṛsu*, written with *s*) = Pali *addasuṃ*, Skt. *adṛśan*; LV 385.19 (vs) *vimṛṣuḥ* (v.l. with *s*), to *vimṛśati*. Probably also *deśayuḥ* SP 57.16 (vs), and 272.10 (vs); but in the latter the Kashgar rec., La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1076, reads *deśayī*, and the sense appears to be that of the optative or future (cf. below), a prophecy. According to Kern, SP Preface vi, the Kashgar rec. records *avocuḥ* for 3 pl. *avocan*.

Aorist forms with optative or future meaning

32.119. As we saw, many forms which historically were optatives are used in the sense of past indicatives. The reverse seems equally clear, tho less extensively attested. In JAOS 57.33–34 attention was called to 'forms in *ī* [also *īt*] . . . which look like 3 sg. aorists, but have the meaning of optatives (either jussive or potential), or even apparently of simple futures. Since the optative approaches very closely the meaning of the future at times, all these may perhaps be classed as "optative" in meaning.' These apparent aorist forms, and others like them which have been discovered since that time, are treated here rather than under the optative, largely because some of them seem more like futures in meaning than optatives; the line is hard to draw. Sometimes, indeed, parallel forms in the context are present indicatives. See the place quoted for discussion and interpretation of the SP and LV passages.

32.120. The following seem more or less clearly optative in force, either 'jussive' (injunctive), or potential. LV verses: *vyākarī* 57.3; *praviśī* 115.4; *ābhāsī* 122.16, 19; *tapī* 122.19; *niścarī* 177.9; *dṛśī* 177.12.—SP verse: *darśayī* 291.12. — *darśayī* Śikṣ 324.13, 16; *vidarśayī* 325.20; all in verses, from Vimalakīrtinirdeśa; cf. the parallel *vinirdiśet* 325.19; *śruṇī* Śikṣ 341.7 and *paśyī* 343.1, 3, 7, all in vss from Ratnolkādhāraṇī, some 3 pl.

32.121. More definitely future in mg. (promises and predictions) seem the following: *uddharī* LV 195.12; 196.2; *saṃpaśyī* 195.20; *deśayī* SP 272.5, and Kashgar rec. for *deśayuḥ* 272.10 (see § 32.118; also La Vallée Poussin l. c. *prakāśayīt* for ed. *prakāśaye* 273.10); *saṃprakāśayī* SP 295.2, *abhiniṣkramī* and *upasaṃkramī* 4, *pravartayī* 7, *deśayī* 8.

32.122. Other aorist forms similarly used: *mucyiṣu* 'let them be freed' Suv 39.4, *saṃyujyiṣu* 'let them be joined' 5. So Nobel, adopting the readings of the citation in Śikṣ 218.3, 4. The meaning is certainly injunctive; parallel verbs are imperative.

32.123. A seeming sigmatic aorist *ākhyāsi* seems used as a future in Mv iii.451.6 *ko* (so mss., Senart wrongly em. *yo*) *me śroṇakam ākhyāsi*, 'who will announce Ś. to me?' Paralleled in line 10 by 1 sg. *aham . . . ākhyāsyaṃ* (but v.l. *ākhyāsi* here also, perhaps read so). Same verse in Pali, Jāt. v.249.8 *ko me sonakam akkhāti*, but v.l. °*si*; repeated in 250.20 *akkhāti*, no v.l. Senart takes *ākhyāsi* as for *ākhyāsye*, a future with opt. ending; highly improbable. Occurring at the end of an anuṣṭubh pāda, the final -*i* cannot be metrically conditioned. I find the form very puzzling; if it is morphologically a future, it could only have *s* for *sy* (§ 31.27), but would be hard to explain otherwise (1 sg. used as 3 sg.? cf. § 31.34, and 35, 1 sg. as 2 sg.).

32.124. Finally there is a doubtful case of what might be an imperfect, with MIndic transformations, with the meaning of an optative; but the text is very uncertain: *yadi śruṇo ekaśa eta sūtraṃ* SP 230.4 (vs) 'if he should hear this sūtra once'. The mss. vary: *śṛṇod, śuṇod, śruṇo, śruṇai* (which suggest *śruṇe*, optative!), *śrute*, and Kashgar rec. *śrāvaye* (optative!); WT keep *śruṇo* without note. If it is the true reading, it may represent *aśṛṇot*. For another guess see § 29.46.

33. Perfect

33.1. In Prakrit the perfect, according to Pischel 518, exists only (in AMg.) in the 3 pl. forms *āhu* and *āhaṃsu*, both of which may also be used as 1 and 3 sg. In Pali, according to Geiger 171, the only really live forms are *āha*, sg., and *āhu, āhaṃsu*, 3 pl.; and 3 pl. *vidu, vidū, viduṃ* = *viduḥ*, 'they know'. However, other old forms, such as *bubodha, susoca*, are used 'in der Kunstsprache', artificially, as 'gelehrte Reminiszensen'. Probably our dialect originally resembled Pali. Actually, in our mss. and editions, regular Skt. perfect forms are not too rare, if not exactly common. It may be suspected that many of them were introduced secondarily in the course of transmission by copyists. But when Sen 54 declares that the perfect occurs in (our text of) LV only from *sthā*, (*abhi-*)*stu*, and *ah*, in SP only from *vac, sthā, ah, kṛ*, and in Mv only from *vac, bhū, bhāṣ*, (*vi-*)*hṛ*, and *dṛś*, he is guilty of gross exaggeration. Without attempting to make a list, I can cite also (besides irregular forms cited below) *neduḥ* SP 23.13 and *vineduḥ* 190.5; *pracacāla* 23.15; *pramumoca* 23.16; *babhūva* 28.1, 2; *yayācuḥ* LV 7.8; *upajagāma* 55.13 (prose); *uvāca* 110.3; 371.3, *provāca* 110.5, and *abhyuvāca* 133.6; *babhūva* 28.19; 111.3; *babhūvus* 386.21; *babhāṣe* 114.4; 199.7; 338.4; *jagrāha* 272.2; 387.8; *menire* 280.20; *śekuḥ* 329.12, mss., Lefm. em. *śeku* m.c.; *viviśuḥ* 385.15; *pracakruḥ* 386.2; *pramumoca* 412.2; *cacāla* Mv i.99.1; *nanade* iii.24.2 (for *nede*).

'Irregular' perfect forms

33.2. Instead of the 3 pl. ending *uḥ, u* occurs, as in Pali and (*āhu*) AMg.; in prose of Mv, *babhūvu* i.153.16; *āhu* ii.96.8 (v.l. *āhuḥ*); but chiefly in verses where meter requires a short, *viceru* SP 331.8; *pramumocu* (but WT °*ca* with K′) SP 190.4; Samādh 8.23; *āhu* Mv i.183.5; 220.1 (here, tho in a verse, not required by meter); iii.370.7; 423.2.

33.3. In Mv iii.395.7 the mss. read *āhuṃ*; this reminds us of the regular Pali preterite 3 pl. ending *uṃ* (Geiger 159); but this ending seems not to be used in our dialect, and apparently **āhuṃ* is not used in Pali for *āhu* (= Skt. *āhuḥ*). Probably, therefore, Senart is right in emending to *āhu*.

33.4. Occasionally (chiefly in vss, perhaps then m.c.) a strong form of the root is used in place of the weak in dual and plural perfect forms; *pramumocu* SP 190.4 (but WT °*ca* with K′); Samādh 8.23; *pramumocatur* SP 460.2 (prose!); *cikṣepur* LV 7.14.

33.5. In Mmk occurs (chiefly in verses) an ending *ure*, historically (and half the time in actual practice) 3 pl., evidently a blend of *ur* (*uḥ*) 3 pl. active and *ire* 3 pl. middle. The only common form showing it is *tasthure* Mmk 140.7; 169.10 (prose); 172.16; 202.26; and as 3 sg. (cf. below) 172.15; 381.3; 429.21; 551.18. (The regular *tasthire* is also used in Mmk 550.8.) The only other form in *ure* noted is anomalous otherwise: Mmk 593.18 *papeture*, 3 pl. of *pat*, = *petuḥ* or *petire* (with reduplication prefixed to the weak stem in medial *e*; in a verse, the meter being correct, thus supporting the reading).

33.6. Another anomalous form is Mmk 381.2 *roruroda*, in a verse, meter being correct as it stands. Here we seem to have a double reduplication of root *rud*, the syllable *ro-* being intensive in character; indeed this could be called a sort of perfect intensive (to Skt. *rorudat, rorudyate*), but not of the type recognized in Skt., Whitney 1018.

33.7. Apropos of the elsewhere mentioned use of historically 3 pl. forms as singulars (§ 25.30–33), this seems particularly frequent with perfects, including regular inherited forms; so 3 sg. *tasthus* Mmk 470.24, *cakrire* 608.4. It was noted above that AMg. *āhu* and *āhaṃsu* are used as singulars. The mss. of Mv also present *āhaṃsu* as 3 sg., tho Senart emends. It will be recalled that 3 pl. 'aorists' are also sometimes used in this way, here as in AMg. Possibly the relatively greater frequency of this use of perfect forms is connected with the obsolescence of the perfect as a whole.

33.8. The Pali-AMg. form *āhaṃsu*, 3 pl. to *āha*, is correctly explained by Geiger 171 as modelled on such aorist forms as *adaṃsu*. It belongs to our dialect too, being extremely common in the Mv (hundreds of cases). Strangely, I have failed to note it in any other text; apparently it was discarded early in the history of our dialect. Both *n* and *ṃ* are written before the *s*, at random; this is merely the usual orthographic variation between those spellings. But also *t* quite often appears instead of *n* or *ṃ*, either in all the mss. noted by Senart (e. g. i.350.19; 351.2), or more often in some of them. This is of course an assimilation to the common, even prevalent, use of *tsu*(*ḥ*) in the 3 pl. aorist (§§ 32.97, 98). (Senart never admits *t* in his text, here or in the aorist.) Another sign that these forms were felt as normal preterites may be seen in the fact that the initial vowel is often written short *a*, instead of *ā*, suggesting that it was assimilated to augmented forms. Sometimes all Senart's mss. read *ah*° (e. g. i.272.17); oftener it is recorded as a v.l.; Senart invariably adopts *āh*° in the text, but it is very probable that the authors used *ah*° by the side of *āh*°. As to the final visarga, it may be present or absent at random, to judge from the mss.; often they vacillate in an individual passage; but on the whole it seems that there are distinctly more cases where they agree on *-uḥ* than on *-u*. Whether we should explain this as due to secondary Sanskritization by copyists seems questionable, in view of the generally very dialectic aspect of the Mv text as the mss. present it.

33.9. The forms are so abundant thruout Mv that it seems unnecessary to quote more than a few. Usually there is some variation in the mss.; Senart's critical apparatus must always be consulted, his text being more than commonly arbitrary. The forms presented are *āhansu*(*ḥ*), *āhaṃsu*(*ḥ*), *āhatsu*(*ḥ*), and *ah*° (with any of the above medial and final spellings). Very rarely final *uṃ* appears, at least as v.l., for *uḥ* or *u* (e. g. iii.199.2

āhatsuṃ, v.l. for *āhansuḥ*); my remarks on *āhuṃ*, § 33.3, apply here too. Examples (all prose); i.8.1; 18.7; 227.5; 272.17, 19; 273.2; 283.12; 299.19; 300.1, 3, 6, 12; 310.14; 311.6; 350.19; 351.2, 5, 7, 11, 18; ii.48.14; 64.8; 67.15, 17; 69.13; 73.4; 75.7; 77.1; 82.4; 83.13, 15; iii.125.5; 126.2; 129.18; 130.2; 163.2, 15; 164.5; etc., passim.

33.10. Since the perfect, so far as it survives at all, is only another preterite in meaning, it need not surprise us to find it provided with a preterite ending (cf. the shortening of *ā*- in *ahaṃsuḥ*, above, assimilating it to the augment). In Mv iii.337.13 (prose) occurs *uvācat* (to be sure with v.l. *uvāca*); the aor. *avocat* no doubt helped to create the form.

33.11. [Senart i p. 453, note on i.99.8 *dadarśatha*, suggests that the 3 sg. ending *tha* (§ 32.117) is here attached to a perfect 3 sg. But he admits that *dadarśa (a)tha* is also a possible interpretation; several mss. in fact read *dadarśa atha* or *dadarśātha*. In my opinion we must certainly understand the particle (*a*)*tha*.]

34. Participles, including gerundives

Present participle suffixes affixed to past participles

34.1. Renou, Études de gr. scte. (1936) page 18, cites some bizarre forms in which pres. pple. endings, active and middle, are affixed to past pple. stems; among them, from Divy 510.8 (prose) *pakvamāna* 'being baked', of pots (*pakva* functions as past pple. to *pac*). He also cites from Senart's Index *baddhamānā* Mv i.76.14, but this must be emended to *baddhamālā* (Dict.). Pali has a case noted by Geiger 191 note 1, *vibhātamāna* (Dhp.c. i.165.11; Geiger is wrong in questioning the form). And several others occur in our texts: (*sākṣi-*)*pṛṣṭamānam* Mvy 6993 '(being) asked, questioned'; *praviṣṭamānasya* LV 7.2 (vs) 'being entered, pervaded'; *vyūḍhamānaś* RP 55.1 (vs).

34.2. I have found only one possible case of the pres. active pple. ending so used: *so 'pi* (*Māro*) *bodhisattvasya ṣaḍvarṣāṇi anubaddhanto alabhanto avatāraṃ* etc., Mv iii.241.5 (prose), 'he, being in pursuit of the B. for six years, getting no opening' etc. Note *samanubaddho* in the preceding sentence. But there are other forms which seem to point to a present *baddhati* (§ 28.19 and Dict.), from which this may be derived.

māna with athematic stems

34.3. Like Pali *kurumāna* (Geiger 191 end) is *śṛṇumāna* Śikṣ 107.9 (vs), the only case I have recorded, except *samāna* = *sant* (Dict.).

āna with thematic stems

34.4. Found occasionally in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 192, Pischel 562); and cf. Renou, Gr. scte. p. 414, and Études de gr. scte. p. 18, top: *eṣāṇo* 'seeking' Mv iii.2.9 (vs), *eṣāṇaḥ* Divy 559.5 (vs); the same form in Pali, *esāna* Geiger l. c.; *vrajāno* 'going' Divy 392.20 (vs); *abhisaṃbudhāna(ḥ)* Ud xviii.18; same form in same verse in Pali Dhp. 46 (classed by CPD as 'aorist', perhaps thinking of the RV 'aorist' pple. *budhāná*, but I refuse to consider any possible connexion with that); note that later mss. of Ud change the text to *paribudhya caiva* (the patchword *caiva* advertises the later redactor's standardizing intent). Also *anucaṅkramāṇāḥ* Sukh 58.11.

34.5. More surprising is *niṣīdiyāna* in SP 295.5 (vs) *siṃhāsane tatra niṣīdiyāno*, 'sitting on that throne', which in form looks like a passive stem with ending *āna* instead of *māna*. Curiously, there is a close parallel in a stray Pali form which has also caused difficulties: *paripucchiyāno* Sn 696. Geiger l. c. cites this as a passive ('befragt'); but to me, as to (I believe) all other interpreters, it seems certainly active in meaning, 'asking'. The PTSD apparently would emend; it cites the form as *paripucchiyāna*, a gerund (§ 35.45), but apparently all mss. read °*yāno*. No really satisfactory explanation occurs to me, but this Pali word and the SP *niṣīdiyāno* seem to support each other. The forms are alike: on the surface, present pples. in the athematic suffix *āna* from what appear to be passive stems (in MIndic *-iya-*, § 37.2), but with active meaning. It hardly helps to compare the active and transitive use of the past pple. in *ta* noted below, § 34.15.

Blend of perfect *vāṃs* and (*ta*)*vant* (?)

34.6. In one doubtful instance, LV 368.2 (prose), the printed text has (*a*)*vatasthivantaḥ*, which if correct would be a blend of the old perf. act. pple. *avatasthivāṃs* with the later *avasthitavant*. Only one ms. has this form (but that the best, A); most mss. *avasthitavantaḥ*, the later form.

ita added to thematic present stems

34.7. This is a common MIndic phenomenon, but is not made clear in Geiger 196, Pischel 565. A better statement in M. Leumann, IF 57.206 f. The regular MIndic pple. in *ita* is based on thematic presents, not on *any* 'present stem' as Geiger and Pischel suggest. It spread chiefly from *aya* verbs, where it was regular in Skt.;[1] when it matches such verbs we shall not list the forms, even tho they may not exist in Skt. (as in such pples. as *kārāpita*, to *kārāpayati*, *kārāpeti*), since their relation to the rest of the inflexion is 'regular' even from the Skt. standpoint. We may, however, note such a special case as *-dhita*, in *saṃdhita* Mv ii.222.7, 17 (vss; in 7 Senart em. *saṃdahita*, presumably to correct the meter), and *antardhita* Gv 444.13 (prose), presumably based on the present *-dheti*. (The Skt. would be *-hita*.) Similarly *samudānita*, pple. to *samudānayati*, Pali *samudāneti*, Pkt. *samudāṇei* with pple. *samudāṇia*; see §§ 3.43, 38.3.

34.8. Special interest attaches to a few forms in *ayita* from *aya* presents, in which *-ay-* is kept before *ita*. Here it is obvious that the *i* in *ita* is not based on *aya* or *e* of the present but on simple *a*: in LV 374.7 *lālayita* (as noun); 420.3 (vs) *vedayitu* = *veditaṃ*, to *vedayate*, 'experienced by the senses'; *praśamayitāni* Mv i.254.8 (vs); *upanāmayito* (v.l. °*nāmito*) ii.168.6 (prose); *prajñāpayitaṃ* iii.93.3 and 4 (so Senart, for mss. *prajñāpāyitaṃ*, *prajñaptāpitaṃ*; the latter may be right, § 38.56); *ghoṣāpayita-vān* SP 257.4; *pratiṣṭhāpayitā(ḥ)* = °*pitā(ḥ)* Kv 18.20 (prose).

---

1. This is the second of the two possible Skt. origins envisaged by Leumann, l. c. Of course Skt. has, even in early times, pples. in *ita* which are not matched by *aya* presents. Some of them are doubtless secondary and analogical, but some may be IE., from dissyllabic bases with heavy second syllable and hence IE ə = Skt. *i* in zero grade (after consonants), as Leumann suggests in his first alternative. However, his only example, *anita* 'breathed', cannot be prehistoric. After a semivowel, such roots had a monosyllabic zero grade; IE $\bar{\mathring{n}}$ > Skt. *ā*, as in *ĝn̥̄to-* > *jāta*. As a matter of fact I question the existence of *anita* as a pple. of root *an* in Skt. Whitney's reference (Roots) probably refers to the pple. *prāṇita*, which belongs to *prāṇayati*, not to *prāṇiti*. If *anita* (to *aniti*, *anati*) really exists, it is just as secondary and analogical as is *carita* (instead of old *cīrṇa*) to *carati*. Only after consonants (other than consonantal semivowels) could IE ə be preserved as Skt. *i* in such forms.

34.9. A rather special case, not quite on a par with the preceding, is *anuvicintayitāḥ* SP 109.2 (prose) 'caused to meditate upon'. Note that it is not a synonym of *anuvicintitāḥ*, which would mean 'meditated upon'. It is a causative participle to a (probably denominative) verb in *aya* (§ 38.9), based directly on the non-causative pple. *anuvicintitāḥ*. One Nep. ms. has in fact the MIndic caus. pple. °*cintāpitāḥ*, and the Kashgar rec. °*cintāpayamānāḥ* (read °*cintāpyamānāḥ*?).

34.10. The rest will be listed in order of the Skt. 'roots', but they are all based on thematic presents (often MIndic; see Chap. 43). Those not marked prose are from verses. They are usually quoted in 'stem' form (in *-ta*).

añj: *añjita* (= Pali id.) Mv ii.234.17 (prose).

iṣ (all prose): *praticchita* (MIndic *i* for *ī*, § 3.38) Mv ii.165.19; 189.12; *pratīcchita* AsP 204.15; Gv 349.7; °*tavān* Gv 417.24; *saṃpratīcchita* Mvy 366; *yathecchita* Mv iii.24.19.

kṛ 'make': *samalaṃkarita* Śikṣ 327.16.

kṝ 'scatter': *prakirita* Mmk 76.16 (prose); *abhyavakīrita*, perhaps read °*kirita*; but see § 28.34; or blended with °*kīrṇa*, °*kīryate*, or directly based on the latter, cf. under *dṝ* below, Mmk 63.25 (prose).

khan: *khanita* Divy 16.4 (prose).

gūh: *upagūhita* Laṅk 95.14.

ghrā: *ghrāyita* Mv ii.251.10 (prose); *a-gh*° Śikṣ 341.9.

chid: *chindita* Mmk 708.28 (prose; text not wholly certain).

jāgṛ: *pratijāgrita* Mv i.270.13; ii.150.8; 152.1 (all prose); probably based on MIndic present *-jāgrati* (3 sg.), § 28.11, rather than phonetic change from *-jāgṛta*, § 34.14 (cf. § 3.94).

jñā: *jānita* LV 414.16 (so with best ms.; *jānita sattvacārī*, 'known is the conduct of creatures').

takṣ: *takṣita* Mv i.5.8 (prose).

tap: *tapyita* (in *tapa-tapyita-śarīrāṃ* 'with bodies tormented by austerities') Mv iii.102.13 (prose; so with mss., v.l. *tappita*; Senart wrongly em. *tapita*; cf. *manyita*).

tṝ: *tarita* Mv ii.294.9.

trap: *vyapatrapitavān* 'was ashamed' (not caus.) Av i.272.9 (prose).

trā: *trāyita* Mv ii.177.4 (prose); Gv 301.17.

dṝ: *dīrita* Mmk 143.24, for *dārita* from *dārayati*, the only active present in post-Vedic; if not a corruption, influenced by *dīrṇa*, *dīryate*, or directly based on the latter, cf. under *kṝ* 'scatter' above, and § 37.28.

pṛcch: *pṛcchita* Mv i.232.15 (prose); 280.4; 324.5 (prose), etc.; Suv 134.3; *paripṛcchita* Suv 134.1.

bhuj: *paribhuñjita* Mv i.19.4 (prose).

man: *manyita* SP 63.3; *a-manyita* Samādh 22.12 (prose).

muc: *muñcita* Suv 49.1.

mlā: *milāyita* Mv ii.232.3, and *pra-milāyita* 4.

yaj: *yajita* Kv 29.21 (prose).

yam: *vyāyacchita* Bbh 92.16 (prose).

yā: *yāyita* Mv i.299.8 (to *yāyati*; Senart wrongly em. *jāta*).

rabh: *ārabhita* SP 408.15.

ric: *riñcita* SP 62.2; Divy 638.10 (prose); Mmk 73.9 (prose).

ru: *ravita* LV 286.14 (prose; twice). Same repeatedly in Sūtrālaṃkāra, ed. Lévi, p. 80 (xii.9, comm.).

ruc: *ruccita* Mv ii.427.16 (prose; with MIndic *cc*, to *rucyati*, ii.464.10).

labh: *labhita* LV 327.12.

vas 'dwell': *vasita* LV 364.3 (Skt. *uṣita*).

vij: *saṃvijita* (= Pali id.) Ud xix.1.

vṛ 'cover': *vivarita* LV 233.3, 13.

vṛt: *pratinivartita* 'turned back' (intrans.) Mv iii.102.19 (prose).

śak: *śakṣita* Mv iii.263.15 (prose), to **śakṣati*; *śakkita* Av ii.23.2; 71.1 (prose), to quasi-MIndic **śakkati* (Speyer em. to *śakitam*, wrongly).

sah: *utsahitaḥ* 'he ventured', as periphrastic preterite to *utsahate*, Mv ii.90.6 (prose).

sīv: *sīvita* Mv iii.313.4 (prose).

sṛ: *saṃsarita* 'passed' (subject, *kalpas*) Mv i.46.4 (prose).

stu: *stavita* LV 294.17; Suv 64.9 (prose).

stṛ: *an-āstarita* Jm 220.14 (prose).

spṛś: *a-spṛśita* Bbh 111.2 (prose); *upa-spṛśitavant* Mmk 47.5 (prose).

smṛ: *vismarita* Suv 103.4 (prose).

han: *vihanyita* Mv i.155.14 to *vihanyate* (see Dict.).

hā: *jahita* Mv i.292.1; LV 173.20; 242.4.(Rare in Skt., chiefly Vedic.)

hu: *juhita* Mv iii.149.2 (prose); 431.14 = 17 = 445.7, 10.

hṛ: *vyavaharita* (mss. *vyapa*°) Mv i.271.18 (prose); *vyāharita* Divy 397.24 (prose).

Spread of *ta* outside its Sanskrit bounds

34.11. Despite the prevailing trend towards *ita*, we find a few cases of forms in *ta* which are not standard Skt. Some are formed from verbs which have no recorded participles in Skt. Others replace forms in *ita* or *na*. On similar trends of MIndic cf. Pischel 564–5, and M. Leumann IF 57.210. Some of our forms are identical with recorded MIndic forms. A special case is *vyavasta*, § 3.112. Examples are from prose except when marked vs.

aś 'obtain': *aṣṭa* LV 390.9 (vs). Recorded V.B., Whitney, Roots; no pple. in Class. Skt.

cakṣ with *ā*: *ācaṣṭa* 'addressed' Mv ii.96.17. No pple. in Skt.

dham (*dhmā*): *nirdhānta* (Pali, AMg. *niddhanta*), Dict.; to *dhamati*, on pattern of *kṣānta*: *kṣamati* etc.

dhā: *abhiśraddadhātam* 'believed' Divy 16.5, repeated later in same formula. In one repetition, 17.4, mss. and ed. *abhiśraddadhitam*; read either °*dhātam* (so probably), or possibly °*dhitam*. Also *śraddhātaṃ* 'desired' Mv i.187.6 (mss.; Dict. s.v. *sadyaṃ*).

bhāṣ: (Skt. only *bhāṣita*, except Mbh. Cr. ed. 3.126.28 *paribhāṣṭaḥ*; AMg. *ābhaṭṭha*) *bhāṣṭa* Laṅk 283.8 (vs; note *bhāṣita* line 10); *su-bhāṣṭa* LV 230.13 (vs); *ābhāṣṭa* Laṅk 283.11; Mv ii.157.16; 234.2, 3; iii.65.3; 92.7, 8; 181.5; 313.11; 329.11; 379.14; 413.11; 430.15; *pratyanubhāṣṭa* Mv iii.393.17.

mlā: (*mlāta* RV, otherwise Skt. *mlāna*; but Pali *milāta*) *āmilāta*, *saṃmilāta*, Mv ii.126.4, 5 etc. (see Dict.); the same passage in LV 254.14 reads *-mlāna*.

rup, quasi-root: *orupta* 'planted' (chiefly figuratively, with *kuśala* or *kuśalamūla*) Mv iii.104.18 (vs); 155.6; 432.9; *avarupta* id. Suv 91.8; 103.7; 113.5; 114.1 etc.; literally, of a tree, Gv 278.22. A back formation from *avaropayati* 'plants' (see Dict.), which is of course caus. to *ruh*; the formation is analogous to 'root' *gup*, from *gopa*(*yati*), if that is the true origin of *gup* (there is another theory).

vas 'clothe': (Skt only *vasita*; Pali *nivattha*, AMg. *paṇiyattha*) *nivasta* LV 157.21 (vs); Mv ii.211.12; 322.10 (vs); 430.2; iii.157.1; 210.13: 267.9, 11 (these last two vss, readings questionable); Mmk 63.2; 68.25. See Dict. s.v.

vas 'dwell': (Skt. usually *uṣita*, but Epic also *uṣṭa*; Pali and Pkt. *vuttha*, Geiger 195, Pischel 564) *abhivusta* LV 185.11 (vs); according to Senart's text *saṃvutthā* Mv iii.185.9 (vs), but mss. *vusto*, *saṃvutto*, probably read *saṃvusto*; *upavusta* (mss. *opa*°) Mv iii.216.5 (vs).

34.12. A special case is *palāta*, as ppp. to *palāyati* 'flees' (Pali id., M. JM. *palāa*, *palāya*). It is probably found in Śikṣ 347.4 (vs), where read *palāt'* (= *palātāḥ*) *asurendrāḥ*, for text *palātv as*°. Like *palāna*, § 34.19, it seems to

be analogical to pairs of forms pointing to presents in -*āti* and -*āyati*; or perhaps directly to such a pple. as *jāta* to pres. *jāyate*. Cf. § 28.54.

Strong form of root, for Skt. weak form, before *ta*

34.13. Some participles show a strong form of the root before the suffix, where normal Skt. uses the weak form. The commonest case is *yaṣṭa*, from *yaj*, for Skt. *iṣṭa*; it corresponds to AMg. *jaṭṭha* (not recorded in Pali), and occurs (in vss except as marked prose): LV 170.12; 180.22 (prose); 223.18; 284.2; 318.4 (prose); 340.15; 341.5; 360.20; 402.9; 423.20 (prose); 437.20; Mv iii.126.10 (prose, v.l. *iṣṭa*); 402.13 (prose); Divy 405.6; 624.4 (prose); Gv 357.7 (prose); 539.1 (prose). — *upagrahīta* Mv ii.247.15 (prose, no v.l.; hyper-Skt. for *upaggah*°? see § 2.7). — *praṣṭa* (= *pṛṣṭa*) 'asked (about)' Mv iii.166.12 (prose, no v.l.). — *adhyeṣṭa* (cf. Pali *ajjhiṭṭha*), *paryeṣṭa* (cf. Pali *pariyiṭṭha*, n. act. *pariyeṭṭhi*), see Chap. 43, s.v. 1 *iṣ*, 2.

Weak form of root, for Skt. strong form, before *ta*

34.14. The converse of the preceding also occurs: *pratijāgṛta* (Skt. *jāgarita*, analogical form) Mv i.258.16; ii.111.8; 180.6; iii.324.10 (all prose); also *jāgṛta*, noun (Dict.). On *pratijāgrita*, see § 34.10.—*pṛthita* (= Skt. *prathita*) Śikṣ 247.16 (prose); if not a textual error, perhaps hyper-Skt. for AMg. *pahiya* = *prathita*.

Participles in *ta* with active meaning from transitive verbs

34.15. As occasionally in Skt. (Renou, Gr. scte. § 152, p. 197), participles in *ta* from transitive verbs may be used with active meaning, even governing an accusative. The usage is not noted by Sen. (*ratnabhadraṃ kareṇa*) *gṛhītāni* LV 124.4 (prose), 'having taken an excellent gem in the hand'; *yasyārthe vratatapa caritas tvaṃ* 164.9 (vs), 'for the sake of which you have practised vows and penance'; *balīvardhau . . . śakaṭā prakarṣitau* 382.1 (prose) 'the two bulls drew the cart(?)'; so Tib.; see § 8.38; *prasādaṃ pratilabdhā(ḥ)* 382.8, followed by *a-* (no ms. has a gerund), 'having recovered their composure'; (*tā gāvas*...) *sarpimaṇḍaṃ pradugdhā abhūvan*, 386.5 (prose), 'had milked forth cream (or butter)'; *gāvaḥ sarpimaṇḍaṃ pradugdhāḥ* 386.7 (prose). — *bhagavantam abhistutaḥ* Mv i.98.2 (prose), 'praised the Bh.'; *upavāsaṃ samādatto* ii.178.1 (prose), 'having taken on himself a fast'; *upavāsaṃ samādattasya* id. 6; (*bodhisattvo* . . .) *āhāram abhyavahṛto* 241.1 (prose) 'ate food'.

Suffix *na*

34.16. This suffix is very little used except in inherited Skt. forms. The only common non-Skt. form is *dinna* = Pali id., AMg. *diṇṇa* and *dinna*, 'given', which is very much used in Mv, rare elsewhere: *dinna* Mv (prose) i.44.13; 232.7; 256.7; 287.19; 289.10; 349.12; 352.3, 5; 355.11; 359.20; 360.10; ii.64.10 etc.; KP 9.13 (vs); juxtaposed with *datta*, Mmk 56.21 (prose); *Aṅgadinna* n. pr. Jm 192.12 (prose; the corresponding Pali name is *Aṅgati*); *ādinna* Mv ii.387.24 (vs); *upādinna* Mv ii.279.14 (prose); *paryādinna* id. iii.429.11 (prose), 15 (vs); *paryādinnavān* id. i.128.15 (prose); *samādinna* Mv i.211.14 = ii.15.14 (prose).

34.17. *ruṇṇa*, pple. of *rud*, is familiar in both Pali and Pkt. In our language I have found it only in the cpd. *ruṇṇa-nayana*, 'with weeping eyes', Mvy 6663 and LV 195.2 (vs, printed *rūṇṇa*°). In Pali it is used both as participial adjective and as noun, 'weeping'. In the latter sense Mv (ii.218.13 etc.) uses *ruṇḍa*; in the sense of an adjective, 'weeping', or more often as the equivalent of a periphrastic verb expression, 'wept', it uses *praruṇḍa*. On both of these see Dict.; they are related to AMg. *ruṇṭa* (cf. Hem. 4.57). [A third occurrence of *ruṇṇa* is presented by Senart's text of Mv iii.116.8 (prose) *ruṇṇena śokena*. But this is a false emendation of Senart's; see Dict. s v. *ulla*.]

34.18. Mvy 6983 has *vidhūna*, rendered Tib. *bcad pa*, or *dgag pa* 'cut off, stopped, averted'(?); Chin. and Jap. 'cut off' or 'perished'. It seems to be a pple. of *vi-dhū* (*dhu*); *dhūna* is authorized by Pāṇ. 8.2.44 but not recorded in literature. I believe it exists in AMg. as *vihūṇa*, rendered in Ratnachandra by Skt. *vihīna*, 'deprived of'.

34.19. To *palāyati* is formed *palāna* (= JM. *palāṇa*; Pischel 567), like *palāta* (§ 34.12), but occurring oftener: Mv. i.270.12; 283.7 ff.; ii.172.16; 235.2; iii.350.1; also *prapalāna*, Dict. That it is a past, not a present pple. (with the suffix *āna*, § 34.4), is proved by several of these occurrences, notably ii.172.16 where *palāno* can only mean 'he has fled'. An explanation is suggested in § 28.54. Most mss. in Mv i.71.2 read *prapalīna*; cf. Ḍh. *papaliṇa*, Pischel 567, 110, 562; the ending reminds one of Skt. *ās-īna*, and of the Aśokan ending -*mīna* for -*māna* (Hultzsch cx).

Gerundives in *itavya*

34.20. The only freely used and indefinitely productive gerundive suffix is *itavya*, added to thematic present stems. Examples are from prose except those labelled vs:

Root *āp*: *anuprāpuṇitavya* Mv iii.287.17.

iṣ: *icchitavya* Mv i.280.7, 9 (vss); iii.406.9, 10 (see Dict. s.v.).

kṛ 'make': *satkaritavya* Mv i.37.3.

krī: *krīṇitavya* (v.l. *kri*°) Mv ii.274.2.

kṣip: *prakṣipitavya* Mmk 695.1.

grah: *saṃgrhṇitavya* Mv ii.479.1. Cf. *grahetavya* § 34.21.

jñā: *prajānitavya* Suv 179.5; *jānitavya* id. 180.10 (both vss).

tras: *uttrasitavya* Śikṣ 200.14–15.

trā: *paritāyitavya* (MIndic *t* for *tr*) Dbh.g. 3(339).19.

diś: *ādiśitavya* Mv iii.420.11.

dhā: *abhiśraddadhitavya* Mv iii.76.6.

nam: *saṃnamitavya* Mv ii.230.15; *avanamitavya* Gv 507.1.

paś: *paśyitavya* Mv ii.107.18.

pṛcch: *pṛcchitavya* Mv i.272.4; *paripṛcchitavya* Mv ii.297.10.

badh: *bandhitavya* Mv iii.55.8.

man: *avamanyitavya* Śikṣ 108.2 (vs).

mṛ: *maritavya* Mv iii.354.7.

ram: *ramitavya* Mv ii.107.17.

ruh: *abhiruhitavya* Mmk 701.12 (to *ruhati*); *abhiruhyatavya* (! to *ruhyati*, Chap. 43, s.v. *ruh* 3, and § 34.21) id. 719.22.

likh: *abhilikhitavya* Mmk 45.6; 62.23.

lī: *avalīyitavya* ŚsP 1456.18.

vṛ: *āvaritavya* Mv iii.55.6.

-*śirati*: *ośiritavya* Mv ii.424.20.

sad: *niṣīditavya* Mv i.354.14.

sic: *abhiṣiñcitavya* Mv i.51.5.

stṛ: *saṃstaritavya* Mv i.273.3 (not recorded in Whitney, Roots, though it might pass as regular in Skt., which has *seṭ* as well as *aniṭ* forms from this root).

hṛ: *viharitavya* Mv iii.265.11, 13; 266.1.

Other non-Skt. forms in *tavya*

34.21. After a long vowel *tavya* remains as such even in new (MIndic) formations: *grahetavya*, to **graheti*, Mmk 694.10; 708.2 etc. (prose); *veṣṭetavya*, to *veṣṭeti*, Mv iii.177.16. The ger. *hretavya*, to *hrī* (Chap. 43, s.v., 5), is an easy analogical formation (e. g. to *hrīta*, as *netavya* to *nīta*). On *niṣettavya* see Dict. s.v. *niṣedyati*. On *svādhyātavya* 'to be studied', Samādh 22.8 (prose), from the denominative

svādhyāyati, see § 28.54. On *setavya*, to *sīv*, see § 28.50 and Chap. 43, s.v. *sīv* (2). Av ii.154.3 f. (prose) has *saṃmrāṣṭavya* = Skt. °*mārṣ*°; cf. the Brāhmaṇa future *mrakṣyate*, to *mṛj*. On the rare *sparṣṭavya*, probably a wrong Sanskritization (blended with *sparśa* etc.), see Dict. Laṅk 9.6 *dṛṣṭavya*, for *draṣṭ*°, is probably only an error of tradition; note *dṛṣṭā* for the agent noun *draṣṭā* in the same line. The same may be true of *nigṛhītavya* Mv i.278.6 and *saṃgṛhītavya* id. 7, for °*grah*°; such errors are found in the mss. of standard Skt. works. Instead of *-itavya*, *-tavya* occurs in *ālaptavya*, *saṃlaptavya*, MSV ii.188.11, 12. Mmk 719.22 *abhiruhyatavya* is likely to be an error for °*hyitavya*, but cf. inf. *-atum*, § 36.7.

Gerundives in *anīya*

34.22. There are a few tentative starts towards a similar application of this gerundive suffix to thematic presents; but the trend never got far. I have noted *a-spharaṇīya* Śikṣ 249.5, 8; *paripṛcchanīya* Mv i.337.17; *apaśyanīya* 'not to be looked at, hideous' Mv ii.447.9; *anutapyanīya* 'a regrettable thing' Mv iii.74.4 (all prose); *aśraddadhanīya* 'unbelievable' SP 230.7 (prose, no v.l.); *upoṣaṇīya* Sukh 29.14 (to *upoṣati*, Dict.); and, retaining *ā* of the old strong present stem, *aśraddadhānīya*, Kern, SP, preface vii.

34.23. It may be noted that the secondary suffix *īya* enjoys a certain extension in our dialect as compared with Skt.; new formations are made with it from various noun stems, including stems in primary *ana* (§ 22.20). Some such formations can not be considered gerundives; some are on the borderline. In such a list as LV 52.6 ff. = 411.8 ff. (prose) it is impossible to make any sharp division between the two categories: *harṣaṇīyās toṣaṇīyāḥ premaṇīyāḥ prasādanīyā avalokanīyāḥ prahlādanīyā nirvarṇanīyā* (second passage adds *aprativarṇanīyā*) *asecanīyā* . . . *śabdāḥ*, 'sounds delightful' etc.

Gerundives in *ya*

34.24. Here have been noted a couple of stray forms not known to normal Skt.: *saṃbodheyam* 'to be made known' Mv iii.74.1 (prose, no v.l.) is based on *saṃbodhayati*, *saṃbodheti*; in the latter (MIndic) form the present stem forms the base for the gdve. suffix *ya* (possibly vaguely supported by recollection of Skt. forms like *deya* etc., from roots in *ā*?). Mv iii.318.2, 3 has *viśodheya*, 'to be purified' (Dict.), influenced in form by the preceding *vineya* (cf. Pali *leyya* from *lih*, influenced by adjoining *peyya*, Geiger 202). Not certain is *duḥ-śrad-dadheya* SP 70.2 (vs).

[**34.25.** Deleted.]

34.26. *a-vibandhiya* 'not to be obstructed' Dbh.g 41(67).4 is normal Skt. except for the epenthetic *i*, which in our dialect is common before any suffixal *ya* (§ 3.103).

34.27. *a-vinīya* 'not to be disciplined' MSV iii.128.20, for *a-vineya*, or perh. error for *avinīta*; cf. Chap. 43, s.v. *nī* (2).

35. Gerund

35.1. The gerunds of BHS function as in Skt.[1] but formally diverge from it widely, being strikingly Middle Indic. See my article 'Gerunds in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit', Lang. 13.107 ff. In Skt., besides *-am*, are found the suffixes *tvā* (or *itvā*) regularly with simple roots, and *ya* with compounds. On exceptions to this distinction see especially Renou Gr. scte. 124. Of compound gerunds in (*i*)*tvā*, the majority go with *aya* presents and end in *ayitvā*. Of uncompounded gerunds in *ya*, the commonest is *gṛhya*: Renou also notes *sthāpya*, *dṛśya*, and some others.

35.2. The spread of *-itvā* started with the forms based on *aya* presents,[2] tho Skt. shows it in not a few others. Most of these Skt. *itvā* forms were certainly based on the present stem, as in MIndic and BHS. Thus *caritvā* is based on *carati*, as *kārayitvā* on *kārayati*; it has practically displaced the original *cīrtvā*. In the forms from *aya* presents the *i* before *tvā* was due to the analogy of the past participles in (*i*)*ta*; the ppp. forms in *ta* and gerunds in *tvā* are regularly parallel in Skt. This parallelism extends to other pairs of forms which use the present stem as 'root' for both formations: thus, *datta* and *dattvā*, to *dad*, weak-grade present stem used as 'root', like *carita* and *caritvā*. The ppp. in *ita* from *aya* verbs is historic; *i* represents the zero grade of *ay* (IE **ey*, as in Lat. *moneo*). The gerunds are unhistoric in showing *-ay-* before the ending: *kār-ayitvā*, a blend of *kār-ita* and *kāray-ati*. If the gerund were *kār-itvā*, it might be considered historic; such forms are known to BHS but are not ancient inheritances; rather secondary neologisms (see § 35.24).

Gerunds in *am*

35.3. These are found in BHS as in Skt.; Renou 131 notes the fact, citing Divy 413.8 (vs) *nirīkṣaṃ*. In Skt. and also here, they are specially used at the end of compounds (Renou 130, 131): Mv i.339.13 (prose) *ālopa-kāram* 'making a morsel, a piece, of it'; i.343.18 *saṃnidhi-kāraṃ* 'making a store of it'.

35.4. Instead of indicating an action prior to the action of the main verb, the gerund in *-am* tends to retain its original function (cf. Renou, BSL. 41(1941).208 ff.) as an adverbial modifier of the main verb, referring to an action contemporary with, or even subsequent to, the main action. Cf. Kāś. on Pāṇ. 3.4.32 *goṣpadapram* (or °*pūraṃ*) *vṛṣṭo devaḥ*, 'it rained so as to fill a cow's footstep'. This usage, virtually expressing purpose or result, is found also in BHS: *śāli-hāraṃ gamiṣyāmaḥ* Mv i.343.8, 13 (prose), 'let us go rice-gathering (to gather rice)'; *śālihāraṃ gatasya* 346.8 (prose). Such forms could, if one chose, be called infinitives, cf. § 35.6. Even adjectival forms of corresponding *a*-stems are similarly used in Skt.: *udahāro*, 'aquam apportatūrus,' BR s.v. (from Daśak.). Cf. the similar use of *aka* forms in BHS, § 22.3.

35.5. In our dialect, gerunds in *-am* may take the suffix *ka*, the form appearing as *-akam*; a usage which does not seem to be recorded in standard Skt. Thus, in the vicinity of two of the forms cited above, we find the equivalent forms *ālopa-kārakam* 'making a morsel of it' Mv i.339.16; 344.14 etc. (prose); and *śāli-hārakaṃ gatasya* 'when he had gone rice-gathering' Mv i.343.4. Others, § 22.5.

Gerunds in *im* (?)

35.6. I find it hard to separate *-śālihāra*(*ka*)*ṃ* from the form *udakahāriṃ*, repeatedly used in Mv, also with forms of *gam*, in quite the same way, 'to fetch water'. This form occurs Mv ii.65.10, 17; 109.14; 110.15; iii.156.12; 427.13 (all prose), and ii.226.12 (vs, end of line; read °*hāriṃ* with 1 ms., the other °*hāri*, Senart wrongly em. °*hārī*). Despite a few minor variants there seems no doubt of the form, nor of its essential meaning. I have found no parallel; no noun of action **hāri* seems to be recorded otherwise. It would hardly help to understand the form to call it an infinitive, tho the meaning would fit such a description well enough.

Gerunds in *tvā* and *ya*

35.7. An overall picture of our texts makes desirable a certain dilution of my statement Lang. 13.109: 'The suffixes *tvā* and *ya*, in their original forms (not preceded by *i*), occur almost exclusively in forms taken over directly from Sanskrit, and are almost always distinguished as in Sanskrit: that is, *tvā* is used with simple roots, *ya* with compound roots'. This is true of the text of SP, at least as presented in our editions, and of some other (especially late) texts. I observed l. c., however, that the distinction 'is less sharp' in some texts, including LV. Of the language as a whole, and particularly of what we may assume to be its oldest form, I should now say that the above distinction holds only as a strong tendency, and in broad outline. There are more exceptions than might be supposed from my earlier statement, particularly in Mv. Compound gerunds in *tvā*, and simple gerunds in *ya*, not preceded by *i*, are certainly less common than the reverse, even in Mv, and much less common—indeed relatively quite rare—in most texts, even in their verse parts. We may reasonably assume, however, that in the oldest form of our language this distinction was breaking down, and that it was later reestablished to a large extent, under the influence of Sanskrit, in BHS tradition.

35.8. Examples of compound gerunds in *tvā*, or m.c. *tva* (other than those from *aya* presents, which are fairly frequent even in Skt.): SP, none recorded from text as edited; for 267.8 (prose) *utsṛjya*, the Kashgar fragment of La Vallée Poussin JRAS 1911.1074 reads *parityaktvā*. —

1. Senart, notes on Mv i.229.14–15 and 230.5–6, wrongly supposes that the gerund may take the place of a finite verb, misunderstanding both passages. In i.230.5 delete the punctuation; this sentence goes with the preceding, and the gerund *atikramya* is quite in order; it should neither be altered nor interpreted as equivalent to a finite verb.

2. Hardly from dissyllabic roots as suggested by Renou 125; see Lang. l. c. 108 n. 2; even these roots historically show monosyllabic (weak) forms in the gerund, at least from roots containing semivowels.

abhinirmitvā LV 83.22; *abhistutvā* 131.19; *tripradakṣiṇī-kṛtvā* 253.21; *saṃghāṭīkṛtvā* 267.7 (so read with mss.); *āvarjanīkṛtvā* 245.14 (? see Corr., and Lang 13.110, top); all prose: (vss) *āgatvā* 109.14; 288.6; *nihatvā* 195.14; *etva* 197.2; *pragṛhītva* 297.21; 338.12; *pratigṛhītvā* 387.7. — *āgatvā* Mv i.18.11; 29.13 (both prose, et passim, common); *satkṛtvā gurukṛtvā* 44.12 (prose); *abhijitvā* 49.8 (prose); *pratiśrutvā* 75.5 (vs); 255.1 (prose) et passim, common; *sametvā* (*sam* + *ā* + *i*) 262.17 (vs); *uditvā* ii.244.17 (mss.; prose); *nihatvā* 328.8 (vs); *niryātvā* 460.2; iii.114.6 (both prose); *utthitvā* iii.392.9 (prose); etc., many other forms. — *pratigṛhītvā* (printed *prati gṛ°*) Divy 239.1 (prose).— In Av i.299.8 (prose), read *avagatvā* (ms. *iva°*; Speyer em. *avagatya*). — *āgatvā* Kv 70.12 (prose).

35.9. Examples of simple gerunds in *ya*. The commonest is *gṛhya*, which is known in Skt. (§ 35.1). It occurs LV 110.20; 115.20 etc. (Lang. 13.110); Mv i.146.2 = 202.17 = ii.6.14 (vs; the rest prose); i.216.3 = ii.18.18; i.289.11; 321.3, et passim (common); Divy 105.1; 251.15 (prose), et passim; common in many texts.—Others: *sthāpya* (in Skt. Renou 124) Divy 582.24 (prose); *sthāpyā*, m.c., LV 109.21 (vs); *dṛśya* (in Skt. Renou 124) Mv i.65.1; 67.1; iii.13.16 (vss); *pūjya* LV 195.10 (vs; read *pūjya śreṣṭhāṃ*, construing *tubhyaṃ* as acc.); Laṅk 4.12; *vandya* Mv i.113.4 (vs; mss. *vandaya*, em. Senart); Laṅk 4.12.—Forms which I have recorded each in only one text: *hāsya* Mv i.244.5 (prose) 'causing to laugh, pleasing' (so mss., Senart em. *hasya*); iii.88.6 (vs) *te gamya nātidūraṃ*, 'they, going not far away'. — *cārya* (to *cārayati*) Divy 43.20 (prose). — *labhya* Suv 236.9 (vs). — *stutya* RP 4.7; 7.19; *asya* 16.1 'throwing, rejecting'; *tyajya* 22.5; *īkṣya* 24.7; 52.1; *kṛtya* 39.1 (all vss). — *lokya* Dbh.g. 44(70).13; 49(75).28; *pūrya* 52(78).23 (perhaps read so in 52(78).11 for *pūrye*). — *yujya* Ud v.9 (vs).

35.10. The shortening of *tvā* to *tva*, and lengthening of *ya* to *yā*, in verses m.c., hardly need extensive illustration; sufficient examples were given Lang. 13.110. A few from texts not included there are: *śrutva* RP 5.10, 11; 12.9, 10, etc.; *kṛtva* 5.11; *dṛṣṭva* 12.13; *śrutva* Bhad 48; *gatva* 53. And *gṛhyā*, read so with v.l. (m.c.) Mv ii.299.10, which must be read (with mss.) *bhṛṅgāra gṛhyā ratanaṃ vicitraṃ*.

35.11. Sanskrit gerunds in *ya* may appear with epenthesis of *i*, at least in verse: *prāpiya* = *prāpya* SP 392.4 (vs); *saṃvarṇiya* = *°ṇya* SP 25.7 (vs); *ābhujiya* LV 133.20 (vs); *nyasiya* LV 241.12 (vs); and cf. *vijahiya* § 35.14. From such forms originated the common suffix *iya*, §§ 35.37 ff.

Present stems as 'roots' before *tvā* and *ya*

35.12. Present stems (especially of thematic type) play the rôle of 'roots' before gerund suffixes chiefly in the MIndic forms *-itvā*, *-iya*, etc. There are however a few cases where *tvā* and *ya*, not preceded by *i*, are found attached to present stems, or to blend-forms showing influence of them. Indeed such formations occur even in Skt., e. g. in *bhuṅktvā*, *-rundhya* (Whitney 991 d, 992 b). From a MIndic present *uttharati* (root *stṛ*) seems to be derived a ger. *uttharya* Kv 32.17 (printed *uttarya*; Dict.); from *krāmati*, *parākrāmya* Ud xi.1.

35.13. So from nasal infix presents: *abhiṣiñcya* Mv iii.353.6 (prose), to *abhiṣiñcati*; *āchindya* Bbh 166.23 (prose), to MIndic and BHS *āchindati* (= Skt. *āchinatti*).

35.14. From reduplicating presents: *juhutvā* Mv iii.426.18 (prose), to *juhoti*; *abhinirmimīya* 'having fashioned by magic' Bbh 152.2 (prose), to *abhinirmimīte* (see Dict.); cf. *abhinirmiṇīya* below; *jihrīya* 'being ashamed' MSV i.14.16 (prose); *vijahya* LV 202.6; 242.17; 211.7 (see Lang. 13.110); Śikṣ 106.11; *pravijahya* RP 59.6 (all vss); to (*pra-*)*vijahati* (= *°jahāti*, but recorded in Skt.); also (m.c.) *vijahiya* (to § 35.42) LV 232.22; *dada(t)tvā* (? v.l. *dadetvā*) Mv ii.205.6 (vs); if genuine, *dadattvā* is a curious blend of *dattvā* with *dadati* (= *dadāti*); cf. *ādaditvā*, § 35.28.

35.15. From ninth-class presents: *abhinirmiṇīya* 'having fashioned by magic' Mv ii.411.10 (vs); to **abhinirmiṇāti* = Pali *abhinimmināti*; I have failed to note other traces of this present stem in our dialect, except in the thematized form (*abhi-*)*nirmiṇati* (beside *°miṇoti* and *°mimīte*); cf. *abhinirmimīya* above. Based on the 9th class weak-grade stem of *grah* are a number of forms like *gṛhṇitvā*, *gṛhṇiya* etc.; instead of *ṇ*, the mss. and editions often write dental *n*. The LV (287.15; 288.7, vss) form *gṛhnītvā* was recorded Lang. 13.115, with expression of some doubt, but it is now confirmed by the same form (or with *ṇ*) Mv ii.432.7 (prose); iii.460.6 (vs) and perhaps 9 (text *gṛhnitvā*, v.l. *°ītvā*, vs). Also *gṛhṇīya* Mv ii.249.14 (prose); iii.144.9 (prose); *nigṛhṇīya* (mss. *n*) Mv ii.241.14 (prose); and with MIndic *-yāna*, *gṛhṇīyāna*, § 35.48. In Mv ii.232.15 (vs, meter indifferent) Senart reads *gṛhṇīya* for mss. *gṛhṇīṣya* or *°ṣva*; *gṛhṇītvā* or *°tva* might also be considered.

35.16. From ya-presents: to the present *paśyati* belongs ger. *paśya* Mv i.192.9 (vs; misunderstood by Senart; read with mss. CM *maitryāś ca*; 'as good men [they attained the first fruit], beholding the king [who had attained it], and the great power of [the Buddha's] love'); and *vipaśya* SP 282.6 (vs). It is as if the *ya* of the present stem and the *ya* of the gerund were 'telescoped'. The limitation of Skt. *paś-* to the present system forbids grouping this with § 35.9.

35.17. Formally in this same category belong a couple of gerunds apparently based on present passive stems in *ya*. LV 194.10 (vs) *utpāṭya* seems to mean 'being torn up', from pass. *utpāṭyate*; derivation from the active causative *utpāṭayati* is at least forced and awkward. And in Mv iii.16.2–3 (prose) read with mss. *yāvad . . . antarpurikāhi antaḥpuraṃ praveśīya* (Senart em. *°yati*) *krīḍāpanako bhaviṣyati*, 'until he, having been brought into the harem by the harem women, became (lit. should become) their playfellow'; from MIndic pass. of caus. *praveśīyati* (*°te*) 'is caused to enter.'

35.18. A blend of Skt. *gṛhītvā* and (*prati-*)*gṛhya* is seen in *pratigṛhīya* LV 240.12 (vs), which might be supposed to show the persistence of the feeling against *tvā* with compound verbs; note that *pratigṛhītva*, with the common shortening of final *ā* m.c., would be metrically equivalent. However, uncompounded *gṛhīya* is found in the mss. at Mv ii.333.22 (vs), but contrary to metrical demands; Senart em. *gṛhiya*, m.c. (perhaps read *grahiya*? § 35.44).

35.19. The type of grahāya. Finally must be mentioned the gerund *grahāya*, and one or two forms which seem to be based upon it. It is clearly MIndic, tho found repeatedly in the Harivaṃśa (pw, s.v.). It is probably a Sanskritization of Pali, AMg. and JM. *gahāya*. With Pischel 591 end (otherwise Renou 128, top), I regard it as belonging to the denominative verb which P. cites as **gahāai*, Skt. **grahāyati*; it actually exists in Pali as *-gahāyati* (derived by Geiger 186.5 from Vedic *gṛbhāyati*), also **gaheti* (Geiger 139.2), and in Ap. as *gahei* (Jacobi, San. 629.9). The gerund is virtually a postposition, meaning 'with' (as in Pali etc.): SP 211.6 (prose); Divy 327.14; 369.21; 380.21; 391.27; 393.18; 402.3; 431.19 (all prose); Mmk 676.22; 680.1; 682.20, 27; 698.6 (all prose). Cf. *grahetvā* etc., § 35.25, based on the same present.

35.20. Analogical to *grahāya* is *niśrāya* (cf. also *upaniśrāya*, Dict.), originally 'dwelling in' or the like, but normally postposition, 'in, at, with, near; because of' (see Dict.); SP 12.15 (vs); Mv i.144.3 f. (four times; prose); 277.3 (vs); ii.260.9; 261.10; iii.53.13 (prose); 271.7 (vs); Mvy 6368 (prose); Karmav 161.1 (vs). It = Pali *nissāya*,

AMg. *nissāe*, and is based on a proportional analogy involving MIndic presents in *-eti* (*-ei*), and/or past participles in *ita*, thus: Pali *gaheti* and ppp. *gahita* : *gahāya* (our *grahāya*) = **nisseti* (Pali *nissayati*) and Pali *nissita* : x (Pali *nissāya*, our *niśrāya*). Geiger 212, end, points out that Pali *anvāya* is based on *anveti* (or *anvita*), on the analogy of *gahāya* to *gaheti*. He might have added Pali *paṭṭhāya*. I have not noted *anvāya* in our dialect; but Jm 35.5 presents *adhiśrāya* 'having put on (the fire)', which is clearly an imitation of *niśrāya*, above.

35.21. Once a gerund *vikreya* occurs to the present *vikreti*, Chap. 43, s.v. *krī* (3).

Gerunds in *itvā*

35.22. This is the commonest BHS gerund suffix. Like the others, to be treated later, which show *i* before (or use *i* as) the suffix proper, it is essentially MIndic, and the 'root' to which it is affixed is regularly abstracted from the present stem; specifically from a thematic present stem, itself often MIndic. In this respect it parallels most other verb forms in BHS (§ 24.1 ff.). The same is true, to be sure, of the Skt. analogical forms in *itvā*, which only means that this essentially MIndic process starts, or perhaps better is reflected, in what passes for Skt. Even in the rare cases when no parallel thematic stem has been discovered in BHS or MIndic, we are generally justified in assuming that such a stem must have existed.

35.23. The MIndic character of gerunds in *itvā*, *iya*, *itvāna*, *iyāna*, and *i* (*ī*) is strikingly indicated by the absence of any tendency in them to distinguish between simple and compound roots. They are all used equally freely with both. Consequently, when we find compound gerunds in *itvā*, even if Sanskrit uses the corresponding form in *itvā* from the simple root, we should regard compound *itvā* forms as directly made from the corresponding compound presents, not as inheritances of the (simple) Skt. gerund in *itvā* extended to compounds. Take as examples such forms as *vyāyamitvā* SP 109.5, *pravrajitvā* SP 465.3 (both prose). Even in verse, and a fortiori in prose, SP does not seem to use gerunds in *tvā* (not preceded by *i*) from compound roots. Therefore, altho Sanskrit has uncompounded gerunds *yamitvā*, *vrajitvā*, I believe the above forms have no real connexion with them, but are MIndic formations based on *vyāyamati* and *pravrajati*.

35.24. The like may even be true of gerunds in *ayitvā* from compound presents in *ayati*, which are very common: *praharṣayitvā* SP 25.11; *paripūrayitvā* 152.7; *saṃtarpayitvā* Av i.368.11 (prose), etc. Here, however, it is proper to recall that even Sanskrit compound verbs in *aya* occasionally form gerunds in *ayitvā* (§ 35.1). Our language also often shows gerunds in *itvā*, minus *-ay-*, from *aya* presents, both simple and compound: *janitvā* LV 234.7; *māritvā* Mv ii.248.5; *prajñapitvā* SP 194.3, etc. These are not historic inheritances (cf. § 35.2); like many other forms in which *-ay-* is lost in such verbs (and conversely forms in which *-ay-* is inserted unhistorically in other verbs), they are late (MIndic) creations. On the whole matter see Lang. 13.113 with note 4, and §§ 35.43 f.

35.25. We should expect to find contractions of *-ayitvā* to *-etvā*, and I noted (l. c.) with surprise that none appeared to occur in SP or LV except *sthāpetv(ā)* SP 91.8 = Pali *ṭhapetvā* 'except' (much more commonly *sthāpayitvā*, see Dict. s.v.). I have now found others in Mv, but not many; and none in other texts. Quite common in Mv is *grahetvā*, to **grahāyati*, **graheti* (above, § 35.19) i.236.6; 297.20; ii.317.9 ff.; 320.9; 322.9, 12; 329.13; etc. In most of these occurs a v.l., either *gṛhītvā* or *gṛhetvā* (the latter is even put into the text ii.322.12 by Senart); but there is no v.l. at (e. g.) i.293.22; ii.342.6; iii.89.5; 111.1. Others, from *aya* presents, are *viśodhetvā* Mv i.4.7; *niśāmetvā* (= *niśāmya*) i.151.16 = 225.16 = ii.28.17; *pravicāretvā* ii.111.16; *okrāmetvā* iii.318.15, to *avakrāmayati* LV 400.14 (non-caus.). An '*aya* present' (tho not of the Skt. 10th class) is *nayati*, also; and *netvā* occurs Mv ii.168.8, *samānetvā* i.185.1, tho in both there is a v.l. (*samā-*)*nītvā*. Similar forms under *-tvāna*, below.

35.26. But even where no present in *-ayati* or *-eti* is regular, or even known to occur, there are occasionally gerunds in *-etvā*; these are doubtless to be associated with the spread of presents in *-eti* (for *-ati*, § 38.2). I have noted *uddharetvā* Mv i.7.14, to *uddharati* (which I have assigned to root *hṛ*; cf. pres. *āhareti*; in any case not to *ud-dhārayati*!); *nikṣipetvā* ii.65.4 (so mss., Senart em. °*itvā*), to *nikṣipati*; and *pragṛhṇetvā* iii.131.4 (v.l. °*gṛhītvā*), to (BHS) *pragṛhṇati* (an impv. *-gṛhṇehi* is found). All these are from prose. The last may have been specially influenced by *grahetvā*, as if a blend of this and *gṛhṇitvā*. And, according to one variant, from an *aya* present but retaining the *ay-*, *pratijāgarayetvā* (v.l. °*garitvā*) Mv i.324.8 (prose).

35.27. In Lang. 13.114 ff. I presented what I believed to be a full list of roots forming MIndic gerunds in *itvā* (also *iya* etc.) found in SP and LV, so far as they do not occur in Skt. (except the common forms from *aya* presents); included were some *itvā* gerunds that occur in Epic or other limited departments of 'Sanskrit'. Many of these, and others like them, are common in other texts, especially Mv, and in the verses (mostly) of such texts as Suv, Gv, Bhad, Samādh, RP; also sometimes in prose, especially that of KP (as well as Mv), and in the Kashgar fragments found in Hoernle MR. Note e. g. *pratiṣṭhihitvā* MR 180.12 (prose), for Vaj 21.9 *pratiṣṭhitena*; *abhisaṃharitvā* MR 191.21 (prose), for Vaj 42.3 *abhisaṃhṛtya*.

35.28. The following is a brief selected supplement to that list, with notation of the corresponding thematic presents (often MIndic). I have taken pains to include specially interesting or problematic cases, besides enough normal cases to illustrate standard practice. References to other than standard Skt. presents either will be given below, or may be found in other parts of this grammar which are cited, or in Chap. 43; often also in my Dictionary (here sometimes referred to, by D), and in the familiar Pali, Prakrit, and Ardhamāgadhī lexicons.

Root *āp*: (*paryāpuṇati* D) *paryāpuṇitvā* Samādh 8.29 (vs).

kṛ 'make': (*karati*) *vyākaritvā* Mv i.357.9 (prose).

kṛ 'scatter': *prakiritvā* Mv i.211.20 (prose).

kṛṣ 'drag': *apakarṣitvā* Mv ii.75.5 (prose).

krī: (*kriṇati*; § 28.5) *kriṇitvā* Mv i.335.10 (so mss., Senart em. *krī*°).

khid: (*khijjati*, °*te* D = *khidyate*) *khijjitvā* Mv ii.252.14 (prose).

gam: (*gacchati*) *gacchitvā* Mv iii.142.16 (prose); (*gamati*, Skt. *agamat*) *āgamitvā* Gv 190.4 (prose).

grah: (*gṛhṇati*) *gṛhṇitvā* Mv iii.144.16 (prose); *pratigṛhṇitvā* Mv iii.304.17 (prose).

ghrā: (*jighrati*) *upajighritvā* Mv i.353.8; ii.137.8; 139.4 (all prose); (*ghrāyati*) *ghrāyitvā* Mv ii.251.10; 295.12; iii.52.10.

ci: (*vicinati*) *vicinitvā* Mv ii.465.10 (prose); (Pali *-ceti*, opt. *nicceyya*; Pkt. *cei* = *cayati*) *niścayitvā* SP 48.6 (? WT with K′ *niśrayitvā*).

chid: (*chindati*) *chinditvā* Mv ii.236.3; Suv 63.5 (vs); (**chinati*, § 28.12 and Chap. 43, s.v. *chid* 2; presupposed by) *chinitvā* LV 195.12; 196.2, and aor. *chini*.

jāgṛ: (*jāgarati*) *pratijāgaritvā* Mv iii.141.15 (prose).

ji: (*jayati*) *jayitvā* Mv i.264.6; (*jinati*) *abhinirjinitvā* Mv i.52.9 (prose; two inferior mss. °*jitvā*; in the parallel i.49.8 Senart reads *abhijitvā*, most mss. °*jītvā*); *a-jinitvā* Mv ii.315.13.

ju: (*anu-javati* Pali and BHS, Mv ii.212.17) *anujavitvā* Mv i.321.6 (prose).

dā: (*dadati*) *ādaditvā* (so divide) SP 283.9; (*samādiyati* D) *samādiyitvā* Mv i.128.9 (prose).

dhā: (*dadhati*) *abhiśraddadhitvā* SP 80.5 (prose); (Pali *dahati*) *dahitvā* Mv ii.377.6 (vs); (*praṇidheti* D) *praṇidhitvā* Mv i.96.10 (prose), as *māritvā* etc. to *mārayati* (*māreti*) etc., § 35.24; or to °*dhati*? Chap. 43, s.v. *dhā* (5, 6).

dhu: (*dhunati*) *apadhunitvā* Mv i.321.6 (prose).

nī: (*nayati*) *ānayitvā* Mv ii.211.15 (prose). In the same line occurs *āneti*, which has led to ger. *netvā* (§ 35.25).

pā: (*pibati*) *pibitvā* Mv ii.96.19; iii.144.14 (both prose).

budh: (*budhyate*, °*ti*) *budhyitva* Gv 315.20 (vs); also in some mss. of Mv for next in some passages; (*buddhati*, § 28.19) *buddhitvā* or °*tva* Mv ii.323.19; 354.4; iii.273.1, etc., common, and often without v.l.; *vibuddhitvā* iii.191.12; *abhisaṃbuddhitvā* Mv iii.111.17; 272.18, etc.; in ii.419.1; iii.246.3 and elsewhere v.l. °*budhy*°, sometimes adopted in text by Senart; in iii.114.10 mss. °*buddhitvā* or °*bodhitvā* (to *bodhati*, °*te*), Senart em. °*budhitvā*, wrongly. These forms must be evaluated in connexion with other forms which point to the present *buddhati*. In Mv it seems that the mss. rarely give clear support to ger. (-)*budhyitvā*, but often are unanimous for (-)*buddhitvā*.

bhid: (*bhindati*) *bhinditvā* Mv ii.239.16 (vs).

bhuj 'enjoy': (*bhuñjati*) *bhuñjitvā* Mv i.306.19; ii.263.17; 300.2 (vss), etc.; (*bhujati*?) *bhujitva* LV 74.6 (vs); see Chap. 43, s.v. 1 *bhuj* (2).

bhuj 'bend': (*ābhujati*, with *paryaṅkam*) *ābhujitvā* LV 259.5. But in Mv usually *ābhuṃjitvā*, i.144.11; 213.8 = ii.16.12 (mss. corrupt in i.213.8; in ii.16.12 v.l. *ābhujitvā*); ii.131.15; 268.4 (Senart with v.l. *ābhujitvā*); 313.14, all prose. See Chap. 43, s.v. 2 *bhuj*.

man: (*manyate*) *avamanyitvā* Mv i.309.11 (prose).

mā, mi: (*nirmiṇati*) *nirmiṇitvā* Mv i.227.7 (prose); iii.282.15 (prose), cf. §§ 35.14, 15.

yuj: (**yujati*? *yuñjati*) *an-anuyujitvā*, printed at Mv iii.160.6; but later, 165.11, referring back to 160.6, *ananuyuṃjitvā*; and so 170.7. All prose, no v.l. noted. It seems probable that °*yujitvā* in 160.6 is a mere misprint (loss of anusvāra) for °*yuṃj*° (°*yuñj*°), to *yuñjati*.

ric: (*riñcati*) *riñcitvā* KP 90.3 (prose); and doubtless read so for *ricitvā* RP 34.12 (prose; as in the preceding case, anusvāra lost by misprint or corruption).

rudh: (*rundhati*) *orundhitvā* Mv ii.75.10 (prose).

viṣ: (*pariviṣati* D) *pariviṣitvā* (so I would read; Senart °*sitvā*; mss. °*śitvā*) Mv iii.145.12 (prose); in iii.130.12 Senart °*viṣitvā* (mss. °*viś*°).

vṛ: (*prāvarati*) *prāvaritvā* Suv 69.12; 102.5 (both prose). In the second, no v.l.; in the first, most mss. *prāvṛtya* but the best *prāvaritvā*. This illustrates the way in which original MIndic forms are eliminated in the course of transmission.

vyadh: (*vidhyati*, MIndic *vijjhati*) *viddhitvā* (?) Mv i.12.5 (vs). So text with 3 mss.; 2 mss. *viddhatvā*; one (inferior) ms. *vichitvā* (intending *vijhitvā*, *vijjhitvā*?); same verse *vijjhitvā* Mv iii.456.11; cf. *apavijjhiyāna*, § 35.47. Senart suggests that *viddhitvā* is 'based on the analogy of the past pple. *viddha*'; perhaps rightly, cf. § 28.19. Yet I suspect that *vidhyitvā* or *vijjhitvā* should be read.

sīv: (**sīvati*?) *sīvitvā* Mv iii.313.7 (prose; mss. *śivitvā*).

sthā: (*tiṣṭhati*) *tiṣṭhitvā* SP 253.9; (*sthihati*) *sthihitvā* very common in vss of most texts (e. g. Bhad 45, Gv 258.1, Samādh 8.22) and prose of Mv (e. g. ii.294.2; iii.42.16); (-*sthahati*) *abhyutthahitva* (mss. *abhyustha*°) Mv ii.38.14.

snā: (Epic Skt. *snāyate*) *snāyitvā* Mv i.4.6; iii.313.8 (both prose).

Gerunds in (*i*)*tvāna* (°*tvanā*, °*tvana*)

35.29. In principle, little needs to be changed in my statement on this form, based on SP and LV, in Lang. 13.117 f. In the form *tvāna* it seems to exist only in Pali (Geiger 208); and the (m.c.) variants *tvanā*, *tvana* are nowhere recorded. We may compare the suffix *tvānam*, quoted by Skt. grammarians as Vedic (Whitney 993 c) but not recorded in literature. AMg. also has *ttāṇaṃ* and m.c. *ttāṇa* (Pischel 583); likewise (*t*)*ūṇa*(*ṃ*), (in this case in free variation with or without final nasalization,) as in general MIndic including Pali (*tūna*, Geiger 211). Our dialect shows no form with final nasal, and probably no *tūna* (one or two doubtful cases below, § 35.36). When meter requires a long final, *a* is lengthened. The penultimate *ā* may be shortened m.c., so that in verses *tvanā* and *tvana* are found (no **tvānā*, doubtless by accident).

35.30. Not a single occurrence has been found in prose except that of Mv, and even there it is extremely rare. I have noted only *dṛṣṭvāna* i.3.13; *kledayitvāna* iii.7.19; *saṃnipatitvāna* 42.10; *veditvāna* 61.11 (so read with mss., to *vedayati*; Senart em. *vadi*°); *viditvāna* 71.6; *gatvāna* 176.16. While I may have missed some others, certainly there is a striking and unusual difference between the prose and verses of Mv on this point. For in Mv verses it is quite common; I have counted over 150 instances, without claiming completeness.

35.31. Even in the verses of most texts it is not too common, but SP and LV have not far from a score each (listed l. c.). Others (not a complete list) are *pravrajitvāna* Samādh 8.29; *dṛṣṭvāna* Suv 238.3; *kṛtvāna* Sukh 54.1; *śrutvāna* Karmav 161.3. And *tvana*: *karitvana* Samādh 22.4; *nihanitvana* 22.5; *pūritvana* KP 20.23; *smaritvana* Gv 213.11; *jinitvana* 213.14; *cyavitvana* 215.5; *spharitvana* Dbh.g. 48(74).20 (at the end of a verse); Gv 231.25. Also *tvanā*: *karitvanā* Gv 34.8; *spharitvanā* 34.11, 23; 240.22; 241.6; in LV 54.15 (vs) read with v.l. *upasthapitvanā* for text °*pisva nā*. The forms *tvanā* and *tvana* are used only m.c.; but it is remarkable that they seem not to occur at all in the verses of Mv, where *tvāna* is so common.

35.32. That the suffix is analyzable as an extension in *na* of Skt. *tvā* is obvious, and is confirmed by the fact that a sizable minority of the instances consist of regular Skt. gerunds in *tvā* (not preceded by *i*), thus extended. Examples from SP and LV were cited l. c.; others are cited above; we may add from Mv (vss) *chittvāna* ii.357.15; *da*(*t*)*tvāna* 365.18, 20; *labdhvāna* 370.3; *pītvāna* iii.292.12; etc.

35.33. Considerably more numerous are gerunds of MIndic type in *itvāna*, based regularly on thematic presents, like those in *itvā*, § 35.28. Examples from SP and LV were given Lang. 13.118. In addition to those mentioned in §§ 35.30, 31, a few of the many found in Mv (vss) may be noted: *bharitvāna* i.216.6; *karitvāna* 268.6; *vijahitvāna* 268.21; *hanitvāna* ii.223.12; *śruṇitvāna* 227.14; *dahitvāna* (to *dahati* = *dadhati* = *dadhāti*) 365.6; *ośiritvāna* (*avaśirati* D) 367.22; *sthihitvāna* iii.45.6 (cf. *sthihitvā*, above); *abhiruhitvāna* 289.1, etc.

35.34. Like the -*etvā* forms (§ 35.25), forms also occur in -*etvāna*, from *aya*-presents, contracted in MIndic fashion (*ayi* to *e*), or based directly on -*e*- stems. The commonest is *grahetvāna*, parallel to *grahetvā*, q.v., l. c.: Mv i.226.10 = ii.29.13; ii.34.20; 39.1; 86.12 etc. (at least a dozen times; also *pragrahetvāna* i.252.3, v.l. *pragṛhītvāna*). Also *saṃjanetvāna* ii.205.1; *janetvāna* ii.318.13 (but *janayitvāna* iii.77.8); *udvejetvāna* iii.77.8 (same line as preceding); *praṇāmetvāna* iii.97.14 (so Senart em., mss. *praṇetvāna*, impossible in meter and sense); *ogāhetvāna* iii.289.1 (Pali *ogāheti*, with ger. *ogāhetvā*, = *ogāhati* = Skt. *avagāhati*); *upalobhetvāna* iii.294.15. In Mv i.117.7 mss. *saṃnivetvāna* seems corruptly to represent some form of this sort, but what? (Senart em. *saṃniveśeti*, which is too violent; *saṃniveśetvāna* is metrically impossible.)

35.35. Of quite different nature is *bhettvāna* Mv ii.12.16, from *bhid*, 'having split'. It is clearly MIndic,

and corresponds to Pali *bhetvā*, AMg. *bhettā* (Geiger 209, Pischel 582; there is also *chetvā*, *chettā* from *chid*); an explanation is suggested for *chetvā* and related forms, which could equally apply to *bhetvāna*, in § 28.50. Cf. *bhi(t)tvāna* Mv i.11.8, to Skt. *bhittvā*.

Gerunds in *tūna*, m.c. *tuna* (?)

35.36. It is surprising not to find in our dialect the common MIndic suffix represented by Pali *tūna*, Pkt. *(t)ūṇa(ṃ)*. But no reliable case seems to occur. The nearest approach to one is Mv ii.12.17, an āryā verse, in a bad state of preservation, where the mss. read *śruṇituna* (v.l. °*nu*), which is metrically as good as Senart's em. *śruṇitva*, and might stand for **śruṇitūna*, m.c. In Mv i.191.2 Senart would read *paśyitūna* 'having seen'; mss. *te paśyi nūna* (one good ms. *nūnaṃ*), which might be interpreted as *(a)paśyi*, 3 sg. aor. as 3 pl., 'they saw', followed by the particle *nūna(ṃ)*.

Gerunds in *iya* (*iyā*, *ia*)

35.37. This suffix is obviously only a MIndic form of Skt. *ya*; it appears in Pali as *iya* (Geiger 213), and in Pkt. as *ia*, *iya* (Pischel 590 f.). It originates, of course, from Skt. *ya* with epenthetic *i* (cf. § 35.11).

35.38. The spelling *ia* has been noted twice in Śikṣ, 299.8 *karia* and 343.18 *parivāria*. The difference between this and *iya* may be little more than orthographic in our texts.

35.39. Like other MIndic gerund suffixes, this is attached as freely to simple bases as to compounds; and the base is always a thematic present stem (often MIndic), minus the final *a*. As with *ya* (§ 35.10), the final *a* may be lengthened, usually where meter requires a long, but in this case also once or twice in metrically indifferent positions: thus at the end of pādas in SP 59.5 *vijāniyā*, or even of lines, SP 125.8 (ed. *vijāniya* but Kashgar rec. and one Nep. ms. °*yā*). According to Pischel 590, Pkt. *i(y)ā* occurs only 'in verses', that is presumably m.c., altho AMg. (ib. 587) has a gerund suffix *ccā* (Skt. **tyā*) with regular *ā*, doubtless influenced by the vocalism of AMg. *ttā* (Skt. *tvā*). It is possible that the *ā* in *iyā* forms is similarly influenced by that of *itvā*; cf. *iyāna* (§ 35.45), obviously based on *iya* (*iyā*) on the analogy of *itvāna* to *itvā*. I agree with Pischel in doubting any connexion of such forms with the Vedic gerunds in *yā*, but am not convinced by his view that *tv* became *cc* (thru **ty*) by a phonetic process in AMg. *ccā*.

35.40. In Lang. 13.119 are cited *iyā* forms from LV, all with *ā* m.c. (*jiniyā*, *bhaviyā*, *avaśiriyā*, *janiyā*, etc.). Others are *kṣipiyā* Mv ii.391.1; *saṃjaniyā* Gv 301.5; *saṃciyā* Dbh.g. 50(76).17 (cf. § 35.44).

35.41. In the same place are also cited examples of regular *iya* from SP and LV. Here a few others will be added, mostly from Mv, where they are common in prose as well as verse; our examples will be chosen from prose of Mv except when stated to be from verses. All examples from other texts are from verses. As was noted l. c., *iya* seems to be specially common with *aya* presents, which will be listed separately. In most cases it will not be necessary to quote the thematic present which serves as base for the form.

35.42. From a (not aya) presents: *paśyiya* Mv i.312.14; ii.170.17; *praviśiya* i.361.5; *gacchiya* 362.13; *āruhiya* ii.90.7; *paribhuñjiya* 96.18; *parilehiya* 194.5 (vs) (to *lehati*, § 28.40); *kriṇiya* 241.17 (root *krī*, see § 35.28); *nidahiya* 320.16 (vs) (so with mss., Senart em. °*hya*; Pali *nidahati* = *nidadhāti*); *prāvariya* 441.14; *aṇviya* (*aṇvati* Dict.) iii.145.1. — *otariya* (*avatarati*) Gv 286. 2. — *pramuñciya* Śikṣ 327.6. — *labhiya* Dbh.g. 8(344).15. — *vidhuniya* (*dhunati*, § 28.18) Sukh 23.8.

35.43. From aya presents: *ārūpiya* (*ārūpayati* Dict.) Mv i.352.20; *śabdāpiya* ii.78.3 (so read with one ms.); *avalokiya* 164.12; *nivuṭṭāpiya* 172.7; *lambāviya* (so with mss.) 172.14; *niṣkāsiya* 174.11; *anveṣiya* 179.2; *poṣiya* 241.15; *sthapiya* 244.11. — *janiya* Sukh 23.7. — *vinivartiya* Bhad 57. — *vidarśiya* Śikṣ 329.3.

35.44. With these belong a few special cases like *grahiya* (LV 297.3 etc.; Mv ii.317.5, vs) to **grahāyati*, **graheti*, see § 35.19; *saṃciyā* (§ 35.40) Dbh.g. 50(76).17, to Pali *saṃceti* (not directly connected with RV *cayat(i)* or *ceti*, but with a MIndic *ceti* for *cinoti*, see § 28.48, Geiger 131, and cf. Pali *nicchiya* to pres. *niccheti*, Geiger 213); *apaniya* Sukh 23.9 (to Pali *apaneti* = *apanayati*, Geiger 131; however, this gerund might be m.c. for *apanīya*).

Gerunds in *iyāna*

35.45. As in Pali (Geiger 214) and AMg. (Pischel 592), this MIndic suffix occurs, tho not very commonly, in our dialect. Pischel correctly explains it as a case of proportional analogy; *(i)tvā* : *(i)tvāna* = *(i)ya*, metrically (and otherwise? § 35.39) *iyā* : *iyāna*. Since the forms are relatively rare, I shall list all that I have recorded, only referring to Lang. 13.119 f. for the occurrences in SP and LV (17 in all, from 10 different roots; note that Śikṣ 353.3, quoting SP 283.12, confirms WT's reading *niṣīdiyāna*, adopted by me l. c.). I have found hardly any instances outside of SP, LV, and Mv.

35.46. The forms practically always contain the stem of a thematic present plus *iyāna*. The chief exception I have found is (*varṇān*) *udīryana* (*jinasya*) Gv 255.9 (vs), 'having uttered' (so 2d ed.; 1st ed. prints *udīrya na*, but *na* as a separate word makes no possible sense; **udīriyana* would spoil the meter). We seem here, for once, to have *-na* added to a regular Skt. gerund (*udīrya*, to *udīrayati*); in other words, a form in *-yana* (not preceded by *i*), comparable to the forms in *-tvāna* noted § 35.32.

35.47. Others, of what may be called the regular type: Mv (prose except those marked vs) *vijahiyāna* i.208.4 (here mss. °*hyāna*) = ii.12.13 (vs); *upagrahiyāṇa* (to **-graheti*, § 35.19) i.227.16; *kṣipiyān(a)* 241.2 (vs); *samīkṣiyāṇa* 278.20 (vs); *ujjhiyāna* ii.13.2 (vs); *omuñciyāna* 73.1; *apavijjhiyāna* 104.4 (vs; MIndic, to *apavidhyati*); *śabdāpiyāna* 173.1 (v.l. °*viyāna*, Prakritic; this latter, without v.l., occurs ii.453.13 and iii.287.16); *supiyāna* ii.201.19 (vs); *paśyiyāna* 225.11; 229.2; 230.3 (all vss); 480.9 (prose); *otāriyāna* 249.13; *anāpṛcchiyāna* 272.12; *kariyāna* 388.4 (vs); *dadiyāna* 388.8 (vs, repeated in 12 etc.); *gṛhṇiyāna* 452.13; *nirdhāviyāna* 471.19; 475.6; *veṭhiyāna* 485.14; *bhuñjiyāna* iii.120.18 (vs). — In Sukh 53.3 (vs), read *śruṇiyāna* for °*yāni*.

35.48. In Mv ii.241.16; 492.6 *gṛhṇīyāna* has *ī* and belongs with *gṛhṇitvā*, *gṛhṇiya*, § 35.15. Contrast *gṛhṇiyāna* in ii.452.13, above.

Gerunds in *i*, *ī*

35.49. This suffix has been recorded only in Ap.; see Hemacandra 4.439, Pischel 594, Jacobi, Bhavisattakahā 39, Sanatkumāracarita 27, Alsdorf, Kumārapālapratibodha 39. Jacobi does not recognize it as actually occurring in San. but notes five cases in Bhav., and there is at least one case in San., *suṇi* 445.5 ('having heard that the sun, the friend of the world, had gone to rest'); and Alsdorf quotes three forms — *kari*, *gacchi*, *suṇi* — from the Kum. The forms of our dialect are, as we should expect, always based on thematic present stems. The extraordinary ambiguity of the ending *i(ī)* makes it often difficult to be sure of the gerundial nature of the forms. Sometimes they may be interpreted as aorists, as optatives, or even as noun forms (nom. or acc. sg. or pl. of *i*, *ī*, or *in* stems). Nevertheless in some cases it seems scarcely

possible to take them otherwise than as gerunds. I have assembled here some of the most convincing cases, avoiding most of those which could easily be explained otherwise. My list is therefore probably far from complete, since there are not a few others where the interpretation as gerund would be as plausible as any other, tho possibly not more so. I derive the ending from *ya* quite simply by saṃprasāraṇa, cf. § 3.115. Otherwise Pischel 594, and yet more implausibly Gray, BSOS 8.575. The forms occur practically only in verses, and in most cases meter determines the quantity of the final vowel. There are very few occurrences in metrically indifferent positions (e. g. at the end of pādas in SP), and the ambiguity of the form makes it unsafe to argue from them as to the original quantity, since there are few cases where it would be absolutely impossible to assume some other verb or noun form.

35.50. All the examples listed below are from verses except a single prose case from Mv (i.3.3), where, by the way, clear cases are extremely rare, even in verses.

abhyokiri SP 228.15 (here might be taken as optative); (*devā 'bhihananti tūryān mandāravarṣaṃ ca visarjayanti,*) *mamaiva abhyokiri* . . . 325.4 'sprinkling me myself . . .'.

stūpāṃś ca kārāpayi nirvṛtānāṃ puṣpehi gandhehi ca pūjayiṣyati SP 152.5: 'and after causing stūpas to be made for them when they have entered nirvāṇa, he will honor them' etc.

upasaṃkramī SP 11.11; 191.1. In the latter passage, the word occurs in a clause that is bracketed between two precisely parallel clauses, both of which contain gerunds (*viditva*, and *abhyokiriyāṇa*; for the latter, to be sure, Kashgar rec. reads *abhyokiri*, but this would also best be taken as a gerund).

puṇyaṃ tato bahutaru tasya hī(so, m.c) *syāt, paraṃparātaḥ śruṇi ekagāthām, anumodi vā* . . . SP 351.11–12: 'greater than that would be the merit of him, having heard a single gāthā from line of succession (of teachers), or having joyfully received it . . .' The forms in *i* would have no subject if taken as finite verbs; and in the next stanza *śrutvā* is used in a closely parallel phrase.

varṣi LV 294.5. Seems clearly parallel to *sphuritva* in line 4: 'having spread abroad (or, 'filled'; *sphurati* has this meaning in BHS) the cloud of the law . . . and having rained the good law . . . he will cut off . . .' This appears to be confirmed by Tib., which has char pa ḥbebs, exactly parallel to khyab = *sphuritva* in the preceding line; Foucaux renders by a future, but the future of ḥbebs pa is dbab according to Jäschke, and it seems that both khyab and ḥbebs must be understood as gerunds, lacking the 'ending' as often in gāthās.

na uttarī prārthayi nāpi cintayī SP 213.10, perhaps: '(for we were satisfied with mere nirvāṇa, or a small part of nirvāṇa,) not asking for, nor even thinking of, anything further.' But these forms might be taken as aorists (3 sg. with 1 pl. subject), and apparently Tib. so understands them (sems so = *cintayī*).

lajji hirotrapatta (ablative) *muninaḥ prapatiṣu caraṇe* (read so with vv.ll. and meter) LV 329.13: 'being ashamed, thru modesty and shame they fell at the muni's feet.' Confirmed in Tib.

tyaji LV 362.7. — *vayam api anuśikṣi tasyā mune(r) vīryasthāmodgataṃ, kṣipra bhavema* . . . *lokottamā* LV 422.5; see Dict. s.v. *anuśikṣati*.

saṃśrāvayi SP 384.1 (parallel with pres. pple. *sahantu*, 'having spoken . . . enduring . . .'); Tib. renders by gerund in na. Interpretation as aorist would be less plausible.

(*te taṃ stuvanti guṇabhūta yathārthadarśī,*) *dhyāyī guṇāṃ vigatakleśatamonudasya* LV 116.10. — *upanayi* LV 166.10; might be 2 sg. aor., but better as gerund; Tib. khrid de, gerund. — *smari* LV 167.2, as prec.; Tib. bsams te, gerund. — *codayi* LV 169.22; better as gerund than as 3 sg. aor. with pl. subject; in the same line *raviṣu* has 3 pl. form, and *codayi* is rather dependent upon it than parallel with it.

magadhapuri praveśi (§ 38.23) *lokanātho* LV 243.11; followed by parallel phrases containing gerunds, *vihariya*, and *arthu kariya*; then *upagami*, the aorist main verb: 'the Lord of the World, having entered . . ., having dwelt there, . . . having done the welfare of . . ., went to . . .' Tib. zhugs te, gerund, 'having entered'. Tho based on the causative form *praveśayati* (Pali *paveseti*), it has the meaning of the simple verb, as not infrequently in our dialect; metrical requirements may be concerned.

tṛṣṇā tanuṃ ca kari chindati putrasnehaṃ LV 200.9, 'and diminishing (controlling, cf. Pali *tanu-karaṇa*) his desire, he cut off his love for his son' (i. e. violated it, acted in spite of it). Tib. (misrendered by Foucaux) sred pa bsrabs te (= *tanu-kṛ*, cf. Mvy 1145) bu la chags pa yoṅs su gcod (essentially = my rendering).

upāgami Mv i.3.3 (prose), 'having approached'. So mss.; Senart em. *upāgamiya*. Seems clearly gerund; parallel with *dṛṣṭvā*. — *vimokṣayi* Mv i.72.14. — *śruṇi* Mv i.207.13 = ii.12.3; so doubtless read both times (with mss. ii.12.3; at i.207.13 mss. *śṛṇu*, which is senseless). Senart has different emendations, both violent and implausible, in the two passages; he understands a gerund.

kurvi Mv i.236.12 (vs; mss. *kurva*, *kurve*, em. Senart; could be aor., but in same line i.241.6 mss. *kṛtvā*, Senart m.c. *kṛtva*). — *avakiri* Mv ii.333.11: *nabhe sthihitvā avakiri puṣpacūrṇaiḥ, bodhisattvaṃ pramudita kiranti* (mss., Senart em. *okiranti*), 'standing in the sky and sprinkling with flower-dust, they joyously besprinkled the B.' — *pravarṣi* Mv ii.413.17; so mss., apparently ger., dependent on *udīrayanti*; Senart em. *pravarṣensu*. The meter is incomprehensible to me (as to Senart, see his note on 412.18).

35.51. Śikṣ contains (quoted from Ratnolkādhāraṇī) a number of probable cases. Quite certain seems *pramuñci* 327.14, evidently m.c., corresponding to gerund *pramuñciya* in closely parallel lines 6, 8, 10, 12; an additional syllable in 14 results in the shortening to *pramuñci*. (This is recognized by Bendall.) The same form 334.1 (by em., mss. *pramuñciya*, unmetrical); 334.7; 335.3; and *pramuñcī* (at the end of a dodhaka pāda) 334.16; 335.9, 13; 336.7. (But some of these could be aorists, like *osari* 336.3, 15.) In the same passage the following seem to me probably gerunds: *darśayi* 'showing' 328.17; *deśayi* 'preaching' 329.6; *ācari* 'doing' 330.3; *nidarśayi* 330.8; 333.17; *vidarśayi* 333.17; *anusmari* 339.2; *saṃgrahi* 340.5; *saṃstari* 342.5; *bhavī* 345.13 (*ī* may be m.c.: *eka bhavī bahu bhonti*; cf. next line, *bhūtva bahuḥ puna eka bhavitvā dhyāyati*, etc.).

paśyi Dbh.g. 4(340).19: *labdhvā samādhiśata buddhaśataṃ ca paśyi*, 'having won a hundred samādhis and seen a hundred Buddhas.' A certain case.

darśayi Gv 240.26; 253.15. The latter reads: (*prapañcarata*) *bālān dharmasvabhāva darśayi vinesi*, 'thou trainest simpletons, showing them the true nature of the Dharma.'

vindi Gv 485.23 *tuṣṭi vindi*, both edd., 'finding satisfaction'. But possibly 2 sg. opt., 'mayst thou find', or read *vinda*, impv., with 487.10 in 2d ed. (1st ed. corruptly *vandi*).

Gerunds in *tā*(?)

35.52. In AMg., and also in JŚ. and JM. (Pischel 582), we frequently find the ending *ttā* (after consonants *tā*, as *gantā*) as phonetic representative of Skt. *tvā*. No *ttā* is recorded in Pali, and cases of *tā*, or other forms lacking *-v-*, after consonants are rare; but *mantā* occurs at least once, and *laddhā* for *labdhvā* is more frequent (Geiger 209). A half-Sanskritized form of this *laddhā* may be found in Mv ii.334.2, 4, 10, 18; 335.2, 6, 10 (vss), where the mss. read unanimously *labdhā*. It is certainly a gerund; Senart em. *labdhvā*, perhaps rightly (but is it not strange

that the same corruption occurs seven times?). Again, in Mv iii.325.11 (prose), the mss. read *vustā*, which may be a half-Sanskritized form of a MIndic **vutthā* or **vuṭṭhā*, representing Skt. *uṣṭvā*; but Senart em. *vusto* (past pple. of the same verb).

35.53. It is possible, perhaps even likely, that in Suv 36.11 (vs) we should read *tuletta* instead of Nobel's em. *tuletva*; the best ms. (G) reads *tulettā* (since meter demands short final, Nobel is right in shortening *ā* to *a*). I know of no other case where the AMg. ending *ttā* may be as plausibly assumed; the lack of clear support elsewhere leaves me in doubt. But see Lang. 13.122 for *kṛtā*, possibly m.c. for **kṛttā*, in LV 356.6 *pūjāṃ kṛtā vrajata kṣetra svaka-svakāni*, 'having performed homage, go to your several fields.' Tib. seems to support this: mchod pa byas kyis (lit. 'by reason of homage performed') raṅ raṅ dag gi zhiṅ du deṅ.

Gerunds in *tu(m)*

35.54. In AMg. and JM. forms in *-tuṃ* (Pischel 576), perhaps also in *-(t)tu* (? ib. 577), are used in the mg. of gerunds; *-tu* is regular in Aśokan. The usage occurs, if very rarely, in BHS. A quite clear case is LV 245.19 (prose) (*tac chramaṇena*) *Gautamenālpakṛcchreṇādhigantuṃ sākṣātkṛtam*, 'this by the monk Gautama, after comprehending it with little difficulty, has been manifested.' So Tib., khoṅ du chud ciṅ (ger., 'having thoroughly understood') mṅon du byas la ('manifested'); note that forms of *adhigacchati* and *sākṣātkaroti*, or its equivalent (see Dict. s.vv. *sākṣā-*, *sākṣī-karoti*) are elsewhere parallel; also in Pali (e. g. SN iv.337.16–17).

35.55. On two cases (SP 330.10 *labdhu*, LV 74.3 *bhuktu*) which have been wrongly interpreted as gerunds in *tu* for *tvā*, see Lang. 13.122; the forms are participles, not gerunds. As I said l.c., *tu* for *tvā* (by saṃprasāraṇa) is phonetically as possible as *i* for *ya*, § 35.49; and, in verses, *tu* might stand for *tuṃ* (prec.) m.c. But I doubt whether any such form is to be recognized. In Divy 476.18 (prose) text reads (*sacen mama . . .*) *nayanaṃ gṛhītvā utpāṭayitu punar muñca*; no v.l. reported; the passage seems certainly corrupt; there is no verb with *sacet*, unless *utpāṭayitu* or the impv. *muñca* conceals one. Lines 13 and 15, just above, and closely parallel, suggest that we should read *utpāṭayitvā* and *muñcasi*. In Suv 36.14 (vs) Nobel reads *gaṇetu*, with some mss.; there is a v.l. *gaṇaitva*, intending *gaṇetva*; a gerund seems required, and the final syllable must be short.

Gerund (falsely alleged) in *dhya*

35.56. Certainly baseless is Max Müller's suggestion (p. xvi) that *ārabhidhya*, reported as the reading of the mss. at Sukh 8.17 (vs), contains a gerund suffix *dhya* related to Vedic *dhyai*. Read *ārabhiṣya*, 1 sg. future.

36. Infinitive

36.1. The standard infinitive of our dialect has the ending *itum*, added to thematic present stems minus the vowel *a*. Chiefly in verses, the final *m* to *(i)tum* may be lost. There seem to be cases of *atum* instead of *itum*; and *etum* occurs, chiefly from presents in *-e-*. The Vedic and Pali ending *tave* (also *tavai*) occurs, but rarely. Commoner are dative forms of other noun stems, especially *anāya* (*anāye*). Other non-Sanskrit infinitive forms are miscellaneous and scattering. For the inf. form in the sense of a gerund see § 35.54.

Ending *itum*

36.2. The favorite and indefinitely productive infinitive suffix is *itum*, added as usual to thematic present stems (sometimes stems in *-e-* or *-aya-*). It is found more or less all over, even in prose, including that of other texts than Mv. Most of our examples are prose; those from verses are so marked.

Root *āp*: *paryāpunituṃ* KP 139.9.

i: *adhīyituṃ* Mv ii.77.13, to Pali *adhīyati*. There is a v.l. *adhītuṃ*, probably only a corruption; but Senart reads so in a subsequent occurrence in the same line, where both his mss. read *adhituṃ*; this also I think is a mere corruption for *adhīyituṃ*. Cf. however § 36.9.

iṣ: *pratīcchituṃ* Mv i.310.4.

kṛ 'make': *saṃskarituṃ* Divy 207.24.

krī: *vikriṇituṃ* Mv ii.87.15 (v.l. *vikrīṇītuṃ*). Senart reads *kriṇitum* ii.88.6 (vs), but the true reading is *vikretum* (§ 36.8; mss. *ketuṃ*).

kṣi 'destroy': *kṣayitu* (for °*tuṃ*, m.c., § 36.4) Dbh.g. 41(67).8.

kṣip: *nikṣipitum* Mv iii.428.4.

gam: *gacchitum* Samādh p. 30, line 31.

gā 'sing': *gāyitum* MSV iv.240.22.

grah: *nigṛhṇituṃ* Mv iii.393.5, 10.

ji: *parājayitum* Divy 285.20, *parājayitu-kāma* Suv 94.17.

juṣ: *juṣitu-kāma* Mvy 6345.

jñā: *jānituṃ* SP 31.10; *ājānitum* Mv i.316.18; iii.318.10; *jānituṃ* Mv ii.379.14 (vs); iii.34.1 (see § 36.3); Samādh 22.13, 45 (vss); *prajānitum* id. 22.43 (vs); *vijānitum* Vaj 43.9 (vs).

ḍī: *uḍḍīyitum* Mv ii.243.6.

tyaj: *tyajituṃ* Mv iii.151.12, 19; Divy 416.26 (vs); *parityajitum* Mv iii.166.4.

diś: *vyavadiśituṃ* Mv iii.50.8.

dru: *abhidravitum* MSV ii.34.4.

dhā: *śraddadhitum* Mv i.185.11 (vs); *antarahāyitum* (Dict.) Mv ii.97.10, 20; (*uttaraṃ*) *saṃdhituṃ* 'to concoct (make, a reply)' Mv iii.390.6 (to *saṃdheti*, or **saṃdhati*; Chap. 43, s.v. *dhā* 6 or 5).

dhṛ: *dharituṃ* LV 29.9 (vs).

dhyā: *avadhyāyitum* Divy 494.8; Av ii.139.8 (the latter by em., see Speyer's note).

pad: *upapadyituṃ* Mv iii.404.8.

paś: *paśyitu-kāma* Mv ii.446.4, 7; 448.9; *paśyituṃ* Mv iii.10.9; Samādh 22.17 (vs).

pā: *pivituṃ* LV 309.15 (vs).

pṛcch: *pṛcchitu-kāma* Mv iii.366.10 (vs); *pṛcchitum* Divy 345.1; SP 280.1.

bandh: *bandhitum* Mv ii.484.5 (vs).

budh: *budhyituṃ* 'to become enlightened' LV 270.21; 271.2 (in both most mss. °*atuṃ*); RP 19.9, 15; 59.3 (all vss).

bhid: *bhinditum* Samādh p. 17, line 4.

bhuj 'enjoy': *bhuṃjitum* Mv ii.56.3; iii.129.4 (both vss); *paribhuṃjituṃ* Mv iii.131.13; 158.18.

muc (pass.): *mucyituṃ* 'to be set free' Mv ii.223.13 (vs); *adhimucyitum* KP 139.9.

muṣ: *muṣitum* Divy 94.29; 101.6, 11; also *mūṣitu-kāma* (Dict. s.v. *mūṣati*) Divy 276.24.

mṛ: *maritu-kāma* Mv ii.83.2 (vs).

mlā: *mlāyitum* Divy 570.25.

yam: *anuprayacchituṃ* Mv ii.147.2, 3.

rādh: *aparādhyituṃ* Mv iii.126.18; 127.2.

lī: *pratilīyatu-kāma* (so mss., see § 36.7) Mv iii.428.10.

vah: *udvahituṃ* Mv iii.252.16, 20; 253.15 (all vss).

vā: *parinirvāpayitu-kāma* SP 250.12 (§ 38.58).

viś: *praviśitum* Mv iii.151.8; MSV i.106.11 (prose).

śram: *viśramitum* Mv iii.350.21.

śru: *śruṇitum* Suv 157.5 (vs).

sic: *utsiñcituṃ* Mv ii.91.1.

sṛ: *saṃsarituṃ* Mv iii.253.3 (vs).

sthā: *upasthihituṃ* Mv i.295.16; iii.24.15; *utthihitum* Mv ii.428.1.

snā: *snāpitum* Mv iii.12.5 (vs; intrans., 'to bathe', despite causative stem; Senart em. *snāyitum*, but see § 38.58).

han: *hanitum* Mv i.312.6; *āhanitum* Mv ii.454.15.

hṛ: *viharitum* Mv i.34.13; *samuddharituṃ* Mv i.98.14 (vs); *samanvāharitum* Divy 357.20.

tu for *tum*

36.3. Not very rare in verses are infinitive forms (either Sanskrit or dialectic) lacking the final nasal. It is natural to assume that they are only m.c.; and as a rule, certainly, they occur where the meter requires a short final. However, the mss. at Mv iii.34.1, prose, read *jānitu*, emended by Senart to °*tuṃ* (next word is *na*; may we suppose that the nasal *n* motivated the corruption in tradition,—that is, that some one failed to hear *-ṃ* before *n-*?). And the form *voḍhū* KP 82.9 (vs), § 36.5, suggests independent existence of the form lacking the nasal. Cf. the AMg. JM. forms in *(t)tu*, used, to be sure, as gerunds but acc. to Pischel 577 derived from infinitives. In Ap., moreover, forms in *(t)u* are unquestionably used as infinitives (Jacobi, San. 18; Alsdorf, Kum. 64).

36.4. Instances of *(i)tu* for *(i)tum* in verses, presumably m.c.: *jñatu* SP 30.12; *pratikartu* 119.4. — *naditu* LV 46.6; in 166.13, read: *vyavasitu kṣapayitu svaya* (so v.l.) *maha-udadhiṃ* = *vyavasitaṃ kṣapayituṃ svayaṃ mahodadhiṃ*; in 304.15–16 *kā tasya śakti mama dṛṣṭva* (so with v.l., Lefm. *dṛṣṭi*) *sapāriṣadyaṃ, notthātu mahya caraṇe śirasā prapattuṃ*, 'what power has he (= how can he), on seeing me with my followers, not (to) arise and fall down with his head at my foot?' — *samanugantu* Mv i.65.4; *upetu* 204.18; *kartu* ii.286.5. — *kṣayitu*, see § 36.2, under *kṣi*.

tū for *tu* = *tum*

36.5. Much more strange is the form *voḍhū*, apparently with metrical lengthening for *voḍhu* = *voḍhum*, KP 82.9 (vs); see § 36.3. Is it a case of the 'law for morae', long for nasalized vowel (§ 3.3)?

ītum for *itum*

36.6. Once the vowel *i* before *tum*, in a dialectic infinitive from *kṣi* 'destroy' (cf. *kṣayitu*, § 36.2), is lengthened in a verse m.c.: *kṣayītum* Śikṣ 345.10 (vs, from Ratnolkādhāraṇī).

atum for *itum*

36.7. Repeatedly the mss. (and sometimes the printed editions) present what are certainly infinitive forms ending in *atum* rather than *itum*. Senart regularly emends to *itum* in Mv; whether rightly, I am not sure. There are many cases where at least one of his mss. reads *atum*, and doubtless more than I have recorded in which all of them read so. If the ending is textually sound, it would seem to involve carrying over of the thematic *a* of the present stem into the infinitive. My pupil Mr. A. H. Yarrow has discovered *āviśatum* in Mbh. Cr. ed. 1.222.10d, which supports the ending. *na . . . śakya akṣarebhiḥ praviśatu* LV 393.5 (vs), 'it cannot be penetrated by syllables (words)'.—In Mv ii.484.15 (vs), mss. *paśyatuṃ* or °*tu*; *pṛcchatuṃ* iii.394.17 (mss.; vs); *pratilīyatu-kāmo* 428.10 (prose), (§ 36.2; to *pratilīyate*; Senart em. *pratisaṃlīyitu*°, the *saṃ* certainly wrong). But in Mv ii.32.1 (prose), where mss. *jāgratuṃ*, an infin. cannot be construed; read *jāgrataṃ* (acc. sg. pres. pple.; not *jāgritaṃ* with Senart).—Divy (all prose): *vyavalokayatum* 179.17; *cāratum* 180.13; *viharatum* 498.3; *avamardatum* 622.17.

Ending *etum*

36.8. This occurs not very often, and chiefly, as we should expect, from verbs which otherwise show stems in *e*(*ti*). So *parākrametum* LV 134.2 (BHS *-krameti* = *-kramati*); *upametum* (see § 28.48) SP 304.10 (vs); *nigráhetuṃ* Mv iii.322.4 (prose); in Mv ii.88.6 (vs) read *vikretum* (regular Skt. form) for mss. *ketuṃ*, Senart em. *kriṇitum* (but the meaning must be 'sell', not 'buy'!); *-padyetuṃ* Mmk 514.24; 540.28 (both prose: cf. aor. *upapadyesi* Mv i.45.10, mss.); *pivāpayetu-kāma*, Kashgar rec. for SP 322.2 (prose).

Miscellaneous non-Skt. forms in *tum*

36.9. A few times a weak form of the root is used instead of the regular strong form. Twice *ṛ* thus occurs for *ar* where metrical considerations may be responsible; *vivṛtuṃ* 'to open up' LV 46.7 and *kṛtum* = *kartum* Suv 156.4 (both in vss where meter requires a short syllable). But in the rest there is no such reason: *utkṣiptum* Divy 279.2 (prose); *udgṛhītum* Divy 579.21 (prose); *nirdiṣṭum* Mmk 4.18 and *anupraviṣṭum* id. 94.1 (both prose); *adhituṃ* in Mv ii.77.13 is Senart's em. for mss. *adhituṃ*, but occurs once as a v.l., see § 36.2.

36.10. Av i.182.8 (prose) has *syotu-kāma* 'desiring to sew'; and MSV ii.50.16 *setum* (§ 28.50); no infinitive of root *sīv* is recorded in Whitney, Roots.

36.11. *śraddadhātum* Divy 6.21 (prose) is formed on the reduplicated present *śraddadhāti*; *pratisaṃlātu-kāma* MSV ii.128.5 on the noun *pratisaṃlāna* (Dict.; cf. also caus. *lāpayati*, Skt.).

36.12. More anomalous are the forms *paryādatuṃ* and °*dattuṃ*, KP 33.2 and 3 (prose), infinitives to *pary-ā-dā* 'conquer'. Should °*dattuṃ* be read for both (influenced by *datta*, *dattvā*)? Or °*datuṃ*, cf. § 36.7? Or, finally, the regular Skt. form °*dātuṃ*?

36.13. Yet more monstrous is Mmk 74.16 (prose) *prārabhantum*, infin. from *prā-rabh*. Should we assume an error of tradition (misplaced anusvāra) and read *prāraṃbhatum* (or °*itum*), from the present *-rambhati* (E +, Whitney, Roots)? Or adaptation to the infin. of some (what?) root in final nasal?

Ending *tave* (*tavai*)

36.14. The Vedic ending *tave* lives on in Pali (Geiger 204); and see Pischel 578 on relatives in AMg. In our dialect it is extremely rare. Twice *attave*, an actual Vedic form from *ad*, occurs in Mv (both vss) iii.295.12 *evaṃ jāneth' anattave*, 'so understand, for non-eating' (i. e. that you may not be eaten by the ogresses); 299.13 (one ogress sends a message to her sisters) *kṣipraṃ āgacchath' attave*, 'come quickly to eat' (the men). Senart fails to recognize the form. In Ud xxxi.2 the ending is written *tavai*, in *prahātavai*, probably a hyper-Sanskritism (or error?). The same verse in Pali, Dhp.34, has *pahātave*.

Ending *anāya*

36.15. As in Pali (Geiger 204.3; cf. Sen 12–13), the dative of *a*-stem nouns is used in our dialect rather extensively as an infinitive, even governing an accus. object. Especially is this true (again as in Pali) of stems in *ana*; the ending *anāya* in this function is fairly frequent. The stems in *ana* are sometimes new formations based on thematic present stems; such as *budhyanāya*, *paśyanāya*, *juhanāya*, (*pibanāye*, below). It is to be noted that such new stems in *ana* are quite common in our dialect, and often show other than dative forms and infinitive functions (§§ 22.7, 8). Borderline cases, where interpretation as infinitive is questionable, are in general not included here. (Sen l. c. includes a number of cases with dependent genitive; these seem to me dubious.) Our examples are from prose except those marked vs.

tam eva yaṃ icchati bhāṣanāya SP 28.6 (vs) 'just that which he wishes to say'. Others, cited by Sen 12–13: *gamanāya* 187.5; *darśanāya vandanāya paryupāsanāya* 425.2–3; *śravaṇāya . . . darśanāya* 431.1; *śravaṇāya* 459.1.

no śaktā siya budhyanāya LV 271.4 (vs); *grahaṇāya icchet* 338.6 (vs); *śaknuvanti ima* (with v.l.) *dharma vijānanāya* 420.22 (vs).

prakrami bhagavantaṃ darśanāya upasaṃkramaṇāya paryupāsanāya Mv i.255.4–5 'he went there to see' etc.; *gamanāya* i.257.12, 18, etc.; ii.101.9, with forms of *anujñā* 'permit to go', also iii.287.9 with *avakāśaṃ karoti*, 'gives opportunity to go', and i.361.20–21 *mṛgīye vāro . . . gamanāya* 'the turn of the doe to go'; *na . . . śakyo* (mss. *śakyaṃ*) *. . . cālanāya* ii.329.20 (vs), 'cannot be moved'; *śakyaṃ kṣapaṇāya* 362.8 'capable of being destroyed'; *paśyanāya* 450.14; 451.1; 453.3, 7 'to see'; *paripṛcchanāya* iii.48.8; *darśanāya* 102.1, 3, 7; 364.4 ff., 'in order to see' (object accus.); *agnihotraṃ juhanāya* 161.9; *na pratisaṃharaṇāya śakyaṃ* 252.8 (vs) 'cannot be turned back'.

taṃ parvatam abhirohaṇāya Divy 113.20, 'to climb the mountain'; *darśanāya vandanāya* 203.20; *kārvaṭikaṃ saṃnāmanāya* 446.20, 'to conquer the k.' — *pūjanāya . . . munim* RP 5.10 (vs). — (*bodhisattvo*) *kleśair na śakyaṃ vinipātanāya* KP 48.7 (vs) 'cannot be destroyed by depravities'. — *no śakyu . . . nivartanāya* Dbh.g. 17(353).9.

Ending *anāye*

36.16. Only in Mv, such infinitive forms not infrequently end in *āye* instead of *āya*. This is not to be interpreted as dat. of a fem. stem in *ā*; the Mv otherwise has not a few cases of indubitable short *a* stems showing datives in *āye* (§ 8.45). Nor is meter concerned; these forms occur freely in prose, and in metrically indifferent positions.

No record of the like has been found elsewhere. Examples (prose except as indicated): *vāro . . . gamanāye* Mv i.362.15 'turn to go'; (*anujānāhi tāṃ*) *gamanāye* ii.101.1 (cf. line 9 *gamanāya* in close parallel); *eṣo na śakyo* (mss. *śakyaṃ*) *maye dharṣaṇāye* 320.8 (vs) 'he cannot be hurt by me' (metr. indifferent); *pibanāye* 432.4, 5; *paśyanāye* 456.8, 14 (also 454.20, 455.2, in both of which v.l. °*nāya*); *darś-anāye* iii.366.20 (vs, but metr. indifferent; cf. 364.4, above, °*nāya*; same phrase).

Ending *ana-tāyai*

36.17. Enlargements of nouns in *ana* by addition of the suffix *tā* (§ 22.41, 42) also may furnish dative infinitives: *cakru anuttaru vartanatāyai* Bhad 10 (vs), 'to turn the supreme wheel'.

Ending *anā* (*ana*?)

36.18. LV 282.8 (vs) reads: *hantā gacchatha pūjanā hitakaraṃ*, etc., 'Ho! Go ye to honor the Beneficent One.' There seems no doubt of the reading. In Ap. an infinitive ending *aṇa* is recognized by Hem. 4.441 (Pischel 579), and is recorded in texts (Tagare, Hist. Gr. of Ap., 321 ff.). Our form *pūjanā* may perhaps be identified with this form. The *ā* could be m.c., if *ana* is the original form (cf. §§ 8.3 ff. for use of the bare 'stem' in lieu of oblique case forms of *a*-stems). Or we could assume a fem. stem *pūjanā*, of which our form could be dative (or any other oblique case, §§ 9.64 ff.); the Ap. *aṇa* would then contain shortening of the final vowel, as very often in Ap. Tagare calls *aṇa* a nom. sg. (= Skt. *-anam*), which seems implausible.

Other dative infinitives

36.19. As in Pali (Geiger 204.3), we may doubtless admit that the dative of almost any noun of action could be similarly used. But in no other category is the usage anything like as clear-cut as with *ana* nouns; most of the cases could be described as ordinary nominal datives. The following may perhaps be regarded as a reasonably clear case: Mv i.61.15 (vs) *yatra care brahmacaryaṃ* (mss. add *bhagavān*, unmetr.) *sarvajñatām abhilāṣāya*. This seems to mean 'under whom he led the religious life, in order to seek for omniscience'. The alternative of taking *abhilāṣāya* as abl. of a fem. stem **abhilāṣā* is unattractive, since such a stem does not exist and its type is hardly common (though the meaning, 'thru desire for omniscience', would be perhaps easier).

aṃ, akaṃ, iṃ (?)

36.20. On the forms *-hāra(ka)ṃ*, *-hāriṃ*, the meaning of which would fit classification as infinitives, see §§ 35.4–6. I have treated them under the gerunds; it may be recalled that, in MIndic, historic gerunds and infinitives are confused (see e. g. Pischel 577).

37. Voice

37.1. Regular passives were formed in our dialect by the suffixes *īya, iya*, from present stems in either *e* (= *aya*) or thematic *a*. Besides this common MIndic type, there were passives in *ya* inherited from Skt., sometimes retaining in our texts MIndic phonology, and capable (as in all MIndic) of inflection outside of the present system. Active instead of middle endings are widely used. In fact, as in MIndic generally, the middle endings are moribund, except perhaps the pple. ending *māna*, but even for this *(a)nt(a)* is often substituted in both passive and middle forms; doubtless it no longer had any difference of meaning in any MIndic dialect. On the other hand, middle endings (at least those in final *e*) are often substituted for active endings (in *i*), but apparently only in verses and only, or chiefly, for metrical convenience. Finally some miscellaneous irregularities, or at least formations not noted in normal Skt., will be found.

Passives in *īya, iya*

37.2. A regular passive is formed from thematic stems or from present stems in *e* (*aya*) with the suffix *īya*, or less commonly *iya*. Both formations are found in Pali, along with *iyya*, equivalent to *īya* by the 'law of morae' (Geiger 175, 176). In Prakrit (Pischel 535) only equivalents of our *īya* seem to be recorded (*īa, ijja, iyya*), no **iya*. According to Geiger, Pali uses this formation (with both *i* and *ī*) especially from *e* (*aya*) presents; the same might perhaps be said of our language, altho in it (at least in Mv) it is common enough from ordinary thematic presents (as indeed it is in Pali and Pkt. also). The endings are much more commonly active than medio-passive (cf. §§ 37.6 ff.).

37.3. The *īya* formation has been plausibly explained by M. Leumann, IF 57.233.[1] It started, he suggests, with Skt. passives like *nīyate, dīyate, sthīyate, dhīyate*, inherited as Pali *nīyati, dīyati, -ṭhīyati, dhīyati* (and the like in Pkt.). By the side of these, Pali had presents *neti, deti, -ṭheti, -dheti* (in part probably analogical creations to participles in *ita*, Leumann l. c. 211). Hence to any present in MIndic *eti* (primarily = Skt. *ayati*) a passive in *īyati* came to be formed analogically. Then, since *aya* and *a* presents came to be frequently interchanged (§§ 38.1 ff.), like any other verb form originally belonging to *aya* (*e*) presents, the passive in *īya* was made from any *a*-present.

37.4. On the other hand, in the passive in *iya*, the short *i* is nothing but the ordinary epenthetic *i*, as was seen by Leumann (l. c. 234 f.); cf. § 3.102. In some cases, to be sure, we must probably assume with Leumann analogical lengthening of the vowel of the preceding syllable; so Pali *māriyati* for **mariyati*, to match *māreti*. For MIndic epenthesis of *i* before *y* was later than shortening of a long vowel in a closed syllable, at least before the combination *-ry-*; that is, *māryate* yielded first **maryate* (or °*ti*), and then **mariyati*; the actual Pali *māriyati* has analogical *ā*. It is not clear that this was true of all combinations of consonant plus *y*; cf. e. g. Pali *Sākiya* (our *Śākiya*) for *Śākya*. In our dialect, most passives in *iya* are to be regarded as containing quite normal instances of epenthetic *i*. When a long vowel appears in the preceding syllable, this may or may not be analogical (as it probably is in Pali *māriyati*, but probably not in Pali *Sākiya*); it may, of course, also be due to phonetic semi-Sanskritization (and sometimes certainly is that).

37.5. We shall try to separate examples of passives of *aya* (*e*) presents from those belonging to ordinary *a*-presents; it must be remembered that the distinction is often far from clear. All the following are prose except those indicated as (vs).

37.6. īya passives from aya (e) presents: *kuṭṭīyantā* Mv i.6.5 'being pounded or crushed'; *piccīyanti* 24.3, 5; *praveśīyati* 223.10; *vardhīyanti* 274.2; *ohārīyatu* 295.18 'let (a tax) be levied'; *kathīyati* ii.17.4 'is told'; *sthapīyatu* 69.12, *thapīyatu* 13, *sthapīṣyati* 14 (v.l. *sthāpayiṣyati*, read perhaps *sthapīyiṣyati* 'will be established', fut. of pass.); *mārgīyanti* 'are searched', *lolīyanti* 'are agitated, upset' 167.12; *nivārīyantī* 174.12 (fem.) 'being restrained'; *prajñapīyanti* 274.4 '(seats) are provided'; *śekhīyati* 423.15 'is taught' (°*yanti* 434.10); *vardhīyanti* 433.14 (v.l. *vaddhī*°) 'are raised'; *upanāmīyanti* 465.10 (v.l. °*iya*°); *dhārīyāmi* 489.15; *vārīyati* 493.1 'is restrained'; *saṃkīyanto* iii.37.9 (? = *śaṅk*°, to caus. of *śaṅk*) 'being made doubtful, anxious'; *allīpīyati* 127.4 (cf. *allīpiyanti*, § 37.8), °*pīyantaṃ* (pple.) 5; *praveśīyantehi* 127.12; *cārīyanti* 176.10; *saṃvardhīyati* 390.3; 405.9; *viśrāṇīyati, pravāhīyanti* 405.2. — *ardīyamānā(ḥ)* Divy 39.7; *pratipādīyati* 226.21 'is handed over' (to *pratipādayati*; so mss.; ed. em. *pratipradīyate*); *abhyarthīyase* 249.30 'you are begged of'. — *deśīyate* Suv 155.8 (vs) 'is taught'. — *pithīyate* Ud xvi.9, 10 'is covered'.

37.7. īya passives from a-presents: *bhāṣīyamāṇe* 'being spoken', Kashgar rec. (Thomas ap. Hoernle MR 133) for SP 327.1, ed. *nirdiśyamāne*; *otarīyati* (see Dict.) 358.12 (vs) 'is conquered', probably for *uttar*° from Skt. *uttarati* 'conquers' (*ot-* for *utt-*, § 3.73). — *kaṭṭīyantiye* Mv i.217.7 (gen. sg. f. pres. pple., see Dict. *kaṭṭati*); *karīyati* 269.3 (vs) 'is made'; *karīyatu* iii.360.1 (vs); *pṛcchīyanti* i.272.12, 14, 15; 350.18; ii.110.14; iii.393.7 etc., *pṛcchīyati* ii.13.21; 112.4; iii.177.3; 392.17 etc.; *pṛcchīyamāna* iii.131.9; *apakarṣīyate* (*mālyaṃ vātena*) i.302.15 'is carried off' (mss. °*yantaṃ*); *śruṇīyati* 'is heard' ii.97.7; iii.297.8; *apāvurīyati* (see Dict.) ii.158.1; *pariviṣīyati* 276.4 'is served'; *saṃharīyati* 371.7 'is destroyed or damaged'; *paricarīyamāno* 423.9 'being tended' (in same line *upasthihiyamāno*); *dhovīyanti* 466.4, 5 'are washed'; *upasthihīyati* iii.23.17 'is attended'; *āsīyati* (to *ās* 'sit') 86.3; *śāsīyema* 166.14 (1 pl. opt. pass. to *śās* 'punish'); *anujānīyati* 176.16 'is permitted'; *rakṣīyati* 298.11; *yācīyanti* 315.18; *parigṛhṇīyeya* 393.13 (mss. °*yaṃ*; 3 sg.; here *ī* may be influenced by Skt. stem °*gṛhṇī*°, but °*gṛhṇati* with suffix *īya* would give the same result).—In Suv 157.2 (vs), read: *yatra sūtraṃ śruṇīyate*, 'where the sūtra

1. Anticipated in principle by Tedesco, JAOS 43.390, who cites only *deti* : **dita* : *dīyate*. — A special and very peculiar case is *sannīyate* Karmav 27.27, 'is known', for *saṃjñāyate*, apparently on the analogy of *dhīyate* etc. to *dhā* etc., with Prakritic *nn* for *(ṃ)jñ*.

is heard', with most mss.; Nobel with one ms. *yas taṃ* for *yatra*, leaving unconstruable *śruṇīyate*, which is read by all mss. except one *śruṇi°*. — *nirdiśīyati* Samādh p. 23, line 1 (vs?).

37.8. iya passives from aya (e) presents: *darśiyati* LV 184.3 and 4 (vs) 'is shown'; *dhyāpiyantānāṃ* Mv i.126.2 (mss. *dhyāniy°*, em. Senart) 'of (Buddhas) being cremated', to *dhyāpayati* (?); *āṇāpiyatu* i.310.14 (v.l. *°pīy°*) 'be it commanded'; *viśrāṇiyantehi* ii.72.17 'being given away' (= *viśrāṇyamāneṣu*); *pūriyantasya* 76.10 'being drawn' (of a bow; = *pūryamānasya*); *poṣiyantā* 223.9 (mss., vs) 'being nourished'; *vāriyanto* 274.1 (v.l. *vārī°*; both mss. *°ntaṃ*) 'being restrained'; *ovāhiyati* (to *avavāhayati*), *sajjiyati* 274.16; *saṃvardhiyamāno* 423.14 (v.l. *°dhīy°*); *mūrchiyāmi* 428.1 'I am stupefied'; *utkhanāpiyamānāni* 439.6; *mārgiyamānā* 460.4; *upanāmiyanti* 463.10, 464.9 (in 464.9 v.l. *°īyanti*); *allīpiyanti* iii.68.11; 405.15; *sekhiyanti* 184.6.

37.9. iya passives from a-presents: *kariyati* LV 185.6 (vs) 'is made' (so Lefm. em.; seems required by meter; mss. *kariṣyati*). — In Mv i.16.13, 15, read *takṣiyanti* (Senart *takṣī°*, all the corrupt mss. end in *-iyanti* in 13, and two of them in 15); *anugacchiyamānā* ii.101.15 'being followed'; *pṛcchiyati* 207.3; iii.39.19 (v.l. both times *pṛcchī°*); *upasthihiyamāno* ii.423.9 'being waited upon' (in same line *paricarīyamāno*).

Active for middle (passive) endings

37.10. Even in Skt. (at least pre-classical and epic; Whitney 774) out-and-out passive forms appear with active endings. And confusion between active and middle is even more widespread in Skt. (Renou, Gr. scte. p. 392 f.). As Renou points out, metrical considerations often play a part; cf. § 26.3. In MIndic (Geiger 120, Pischel 452) these tendencies are carried much farther; the middle is moribund, and the passive has very largely active endings. Only the pple. in *māna* is found to be still fully alive in both Pali and 'all dialects' of Pkt.; even it may, however, be replaced by active forms in *ant(a)*, *at(a)*. Naturally, then, our language, like MIndic in general, shows pretty complete confusion in regard to voice, in comparison with Sanskrit.[2] As we saw, even the specifically passive forms in *īya* (*iya*) more often than not have active endings.

37.11. A few (out of many) examples of active forms from verbs which in Skt. are middle only: *muhūrtam āgamaya* 'wait a moment' LV 103.3 (prose), to Skt. *āgamayate*; *utpadyati* 'is produced, arises' Mv i.81.2, *utpadyanti* i.121.14 (twice; all prose); *samutpadyati* SP 46.13 (vs, could be m.c. for *°te*); *āpatsyatha* 'you will attain' SP 73.7 (prose; below in 9, *āpadyante*, and in 13 *āpatsyāmahe*).

37.12. When the only difference in ending consists in substitution of final *i* for *e*, in verses, one may often suppose that metrical convenience is concerned, as in the following (some known to Epic Skt.): *dṛśyanti* 'are seen' SP 9.7; 16.6; 24.4, 6; *ucyati* 'is called' LV 28.8; *parihīyati* 'is lost' LV 175.4; *chidyanti* 'are cut off' LV 223.15; *śrūyati* 'is heard' LV 416.11; Samādh 19.23, 24; *upajāyati* 'is produced' LV 420.4; *anunīyati*, *pratihanyati*, Samādh 19.33. Sometimes before a word in initial vowel the *i* of the ending becomes consonantal: *dahyaty* (*amano°*) 'is burned' SP 85.14 (vs); *dṛśyanty ekaṃ yathā* 'were seen as one' LV 280.12 (vs; in both the preceding and following lines *dṛśyante* occurs). Noteworthy is *pūryati* 'is filled' Ud xvii.5, twice in one verse, in the oldest ms.; one of the two is changed to *pūryate* in a later ms. The Pali parallel (Dhp. 121) has *pūrati*.

37.13. But exactly similar forms are also found commonly in the prose of Mv, as: *upajāyati* i.7.6; *pratividhyanti* 'are penetrated' 7.13; *dahyanti* 'are burned' 25.4; *prajñāyati* 'is observed' 27.6; *vipacyati* 'is matured' 104.6 (mss. *°nti*); *vādyanti* 'are sounded, played' 144.15; 214.7; *ghātayiṣyasi* (so with mss., Senart em. wrongly) 'you will be killed' 244.2; *kriyanti* 'are made' 352.17, 18; *khādyati* 'is eaten' ii.152.16; *hanyanti* 'are slain' 213.7; and many others.

37.14. And other active endings are common enough in passive forms, where meter can not be a controlling factor: *dhakṣyatha* 'you will be burned' (for *°yadhve*) SP 73.7 (prose); *saṃtapyatha* (2 mss. *°yadhve*) 74.4 (prose); *dahyeyu* 'they would be burned' 86.8 (vs). — *dīyatu* 'let be given' LV 109.20 (vs); *paripūryatu* 'let be fulfilled' 200.11 (vs; in 235.19 *paripūryato*, m.c. for *°tu* = *°tām*, § 30.14); *abhiyujyatha* (impv., to pass. *abhiyujyate* which in our language seems to replace a middle *abhiyuṅkte* etc.) 'apply yourselves' 203.4 (cf. *abhiyujyadhve*, v.l. *°yatha*, as impv., for presumptive Skt. *abhiyuṅgdhvam*, SP 79.11, prose; *abhiyujyante* SP 80.5 and 7, in the latter v.l. *°nti*); read with v.l. *upanāmye* (for *°yet*, 3 sg. opt. pass.) *'yaṃ* 'let him be offered (food)' LV 386.17. — *dṛśyatu* 'be it regarded' Mv i.150.4 = 218.5 = ii.20.4 (vs); *dīyatu*, *mucyatu*, *haniṣyati* (all passives) i.311.15 (prose); *chindiṣyaṃ* 'I shall be cut' (for *°ṣye*) ii.173.14 (prose); *vadhiṣyaṃ* 'I shall be slain' iii.352.14 (vs); *vucyāmi* 'I am told' (for *ucye*) i.362.19 (prose); *mā ... vihanyāhi* (for *°yasva*) 'be not downcast, subject to disappointment' ii.405.16 (vs). — *paridahyāmi* 'I am tormented' (for *°ye*) Divy 420.6 (prose). — *ucchoṣyatu*, *vikīryatu*, *vicchidyatu*, *prapūryatu*, *viśudhyatu* (all 3 sg. impv. pass.) Suv 53.10–14 (vss). — *kṣaṇyema* Śikṣ 92.1; *kṣaṇyati* 92.3 (both prose).

37.15. A few examples of present participles with active ending (otherwise mostly normal Skt.) may be listed separately, in view of the fact noted § 37.1 that the middle ending *māna* is still alive in MIndic generally (as it is, of course, also here): *dahyanto* (so with mss., or with WT *adahyanto*) 'being burned' = *dahyamānaḥ* (nom. sg. masc.) SP 254.8 (vs); *dahyataḥ* = *°mānān* (acc. pl. masc.) 321.3 (prose); *ākruśyataḥ* = *ākruśyamānasya* 'of him being reviled' 378.12 (prose). — *prohyatas* (so with v.l. for Lefm. *prodgatas*) = *prohyamānān*, acc. pl. pple. pass. of *pra-vah* 'being carried away' LV 358.6 (vs); *uhyataḥ* (so read with best mss., others *°tāḥ*, Lefm. em. *°tā*) 361.4 (vs). — (All Mv cases prose:) *upanīyantā* = *°yamānāḥ* (nom. pl. masc.) 'being led' Mv i.132.9; *satkriyanto* = *°yamānaḥ* (nom. sg. masc.) 'being revered' 308.17; *aprajñāyantehi* = *aprajñāyamāneṣu* (which is actually used below in line 5) 'not being known' 339.2 ff.; *amucyantiye* = *°yamānayā* (instr. sg. fem.) 'not being released 363.7; *nīyanto* = *nīyamānaḥ* ii.155.17; 168.13; *labhyanto* (mss.) = *labhyamānaḥ* iii.166.9. — *abhinirmimīyantaṃ* (acc. sg. masc.) 'being magically created' Gv 444.15 (prose). Note reduplicated stem; cf. § 37.37.

37.16. Yet more bizarre seem some cases in which the passive sign *ya* is not found, and what looks like a plain active form is used in passive meaning. The connecting link is clearly the use of middle forms which had meanings indistinguishable from passives. Thus in Skt. *muñcati* means 'releases', but *muñcate*, mid., 'frees himself' or 'is freed', virtually = *mucyate*, pass. Now since MIndic and BHS freely use active for middle endings, they may also say *muñcati* for *muñcate*, 'is freed'; hence Mv i.308.8–9 (prose) *vyādhitā vyādhito muñcanti* 'the sick are freed from sickness'. Perhaps of similar origin, and in any case found in Pali, is *bhañjati* 'breaks', intransitive, LV 175.17.

2. Note, however, that the passive value of such an ending as *-te* is still vigorous enough, at times, to give birth to a corresponding active in *-ti*: *saṃdṛśyati* 'sees' Gv 523.21 (prose), formed as a direct pendant to *saṃdṛśyate* 'is seen'; likewise *dṛśyati* (see Dict. s.vv.). Cf. § 37.23.

This meaning might attach to Skt. *bhajyate* (pass.); no middle seems to be recorded in Skt. except in the perfect, and the active is always transitive acc. to BR except for a single form *babhañja*, for which BR would read *babhañje*. In Pali, *bhañjati* is both trans. and intrans.; perhaps when intrans. it represents **bhañjate*, or a more Sanskritic *bhaṅkte*, middle.

37.17. A quite normal-seeming 1 sg. optative active is used with definitely passive meaning in SP 113.3 (vs, end of line, meter not concerned in ending): *veṣṭiṃ pi ca kārayeyam*, 'and I might be made to perform forced labor.'

37.18. In this light, doubtless, are to be understood such participles as *pīḍayantā* 'being tormented' Mv i.5.10 (prose), which represents *pīḍayamāna* 'undergoing torment', mid., instead of pass. *pīḍyamāna*. Senart emends this to *pīḍiyantā* (cf. § 37.8), but inconsistently keeps the precisely similar *prārthayantī* of Mv ii.69.7 (prose), 'being asked for' (*yaśodharā . . . devadattena*); the mss. are recorded as reading °*yanti*, which certainly intends nom. sg. fem.; repeated in line 9 with even worse corruptions in the mss., but intending the same form, while between the two, in line 8, occurs *devadattena ca prārthayamānā*, middle (not passive!); the same *prārthayantī*, correctly written, as passive, in ii.72.12 and 13. Similarly *saṃjñāpayamānāḥ* Mv i.23.11 (prose; kept by Senart) 'being signalled to' is a middle pple. in passive sense. And from the non-causative of the same verb, a middle finite form is used in passive sense, LV 289.4–5 (prose) *ekaikaś ca bodhisattvo devaputraiś caivaṃ saṃjānīte sma*, 'and each several Bodhisattva was thus imagined by the gods'.

37.19. I hesitate to class here *stuvantaṃ* (acc. sg. pres. pple.) 'being praised', on which see § 37.35.

37.20. On the other hand, *paśyeta* LV 29.8 (vs) 'she would be seen' is irregular only in that in Skt. *dṛśyate* is used as the passive to *paś*, while both *paśyati* and *paśyate* are only active in sense, 'sees'. In our language, however, there is even with active ending a *paśyati* 'is seen' LV 419.12 (vs, perhaps °*ti* m.c. for °*te*). Perhaps *vahyanti* 'flow' (subject 'rivers') LV 398.6 (prose) is to be judged similarly; see Chap. 43, s.v. *vah* (3).

37.21. Like other *a*- (and *ya*-) presents, passive forms in *ya* may be enlarged by a second syllable *ya*, on the model of causatives that are indistinguishable in meaning from transitive *a*-presents. So *ghuṣyayante* = *ghuṣyante* 'are resounded'; *saṃvidyayante* = *saṃvidyante* 'are on hand'. See § 38.21.

37.21 a. Contrariwise, the *y*(*a*) of the passive sign is lost, after long vowels, in a group of future forms treated in § 31.3.

Seemingly passive forms with active meaning, and usually active endings

37.22. There is one well-known case, at least, in Epic Sanskrit, of a seemingly out-and-out passive form with active meaning. Skt. *śakyate* is regularly passive to *śak* 'be able', and is either used impersonally, or if it has a personal subject, is then accompanied by an infinitive which we translate by a passive (Speyer, Skt. Syntax § 387). But in the epic, *śakyate* may mean 'he can', and may then also have active endings, *śakyati* etc. Such forms are fairly common in BHS (examples Chap. 43, s.v. *śak* 3); and so Pali *sakkati*, Pkt. *sakkai*.

37.23. Our language shows other forms which seem comparable with this:[3] *ādīyati* (also *ādiyati*) 'takes' (as also Pali *ādiyati*), cf. Skt. *ādīyate*, passive of *ā-dā*, 'is taken'; *āhūyati* 'calls on, challenges'; *ākhyāyati* 'tells' (Pali *akkhāyati*, usually passive like Skt. *ākhyāyate*, but at least once active, see Dict.). These are included as *ya*-presents in my classification of non-Sanskritic presents, §§ 28.24, 25. Some of those listed in § 28.28 probably also belong here.

Medio-passive for active endings

37.24. The confusion of medio-passive and active endings also shows itself in substitution of the former for the latter. So far as I have noted, however, this occurs only in endings (present or future indic.) which show final *e* instead of *i*, and only in verses. It seems to be almost exclusively occasioned by metrical convenience; in one or two cases it occurs at the end of lines but it is doubtful whether even these are exceptions. (In LV 54.15 read *upasthapitvanā*, ger., for *upasthapisva nā* of ed.) — *bhavate* = *bhavati* SP 63.1; LV 190.2; *bhaviṣyate* SP 149.6, 10; *bheṣyate* LV 54.12 (cf. *bheṣyatī*, with *ī* m.c. for *i*, 54.5, and below); *darśayate* SP 24.10; 127.10; *vadate* 25.12; *vineṣyase* 67.12; *spṛśiṣyase* = *sprakṣyasi* 67.14; *cintayante* (also Epic Skt.) 87.2; *saṃśrāvayate* 127.11; *paśyate* 355.8; *sthāpite* for *sthāpayati* (see § 3.48) LV 74.22; *śoṣayate* 174.19; *jāyate* for *jayati* (Dict.) LV 262.12 and 13 (*nāśūro jāyate senāṃ . . . śūras tu jāyate senāṃ*); *kārayate* Mv i.117.6 (certainly m.c.; note parallel *kārayati* in preceding line). Others, § 3.61.

37.25. Twice at the end of rathoddhatā lines, in the same passage, LV has final *e* for *i*: *janeṣyase* (one ms. °*si*; cannot be taken as pass. or intrans.; 'you will produce' [in such persons great faith and joy]) LV 54.2; and *bheṣyate* 54.14 (one ms. °*ti*). At the end of lines of this meter a long syllable is usual in LV, and was perhaps originally required; note however the exception *śruṇiṣyati* 54.6. These are the only cases I have noted of final *e* for *i* in verb endings in positions where the meter may, perhaps, not demand a long syllable; but probably others occur.

Non-present forms from passive stems

37.26. As in MIndic generally, the passive stem is inflected independently: aorists, futures, infinitives, and even (occasionally) past participles are formed on it. Thus, aorists: *dṛśyiṣu* 'were seen' LV 74.12 (vs); *vādyiṣu* 'were made to sound' LV 194.2 (vs); *vādyetsu* id. Mv ii.186.2 (vs); *pravādyetsuḥ* Mv ii.286.14 (prose); *saṃpravādyi* (3 pl.) Mv ii.328.2 (vs); *vādhyī* (for *bā*°, to pass. of *bādh*) 'were oppressed' LV 222.6 (vs); *bhijje* (so Senart, mss. *bhojje*; with *jj* for *dy*, to *bhidyate*) 'was split' Mv ii.412.11 (prose).—Futures: see § 31.2.—Infinitives: *mucyituṃ* 'to be released' Mv ii.223.13 (vs); *adhimucyitum* KP 139.9 (prose). — Past pple.: *kiṃ ti vihanyitena* Mv i.155.14 (vs) 'what's the use of your being depressed?' (either pple. or substantive, according as *ti* for *te* be taken as instr. or gen.). (Cf. Pali *chijjita*, ppp. to passive *chijjati* = Skt. *chidyate*.)

Middle Indic phonology in passive forms

37.27. Definitely MIndic phonology occurs not infrequently in passive forms inherited from Skt. Thus we find forms with MIndic assimilation of *y* to a preceding consonant, like (*v*)*uccati* for *ucyate*, *khajjati* etc. for *khādyate*, *bhajjati* etc. for *bhajyate*, *-paccate*, °*ti*, etc. for *pacyate*;

3. Or are they, and perhaps even Epic Skt. and BHS *śakyati*, to be regarded as newly created actives, based on Skt. passives (*ādīyate* etc.), from which they differ only in having active endings? So we have explained *dṛśyati* 'sees' in § 37.10, n. 2. In Epic Skt., however, and at least once (Divy 374.19) in BHS, even *śakyate*, with passive endings, may have active meaning.

see § 2.8; on *sannīyate* see § 37.3 n. 1. The prothetic *v* in *vuccati* and the like is, of course, also a direct retention from MIndic: see §§ 2.50–55. In Mv ii.79.4 ff. (vss) occurs eleven times a form which the mss. mostly write *mṛyati* or °*te*, but which meter proves must have had a long first syllable. Senart writes *mṛyyati* or *mṛyyate* (the latter seems to be the reading of both mss. at 80.3); the same verse in Pali, Jāt. iv.53.9, has *mīyare*. Probably something like Senart's reading was intended.

37.28. The participles *nistīrita-* (§ 38.10) and *dīrita-* (§ 34.10) imply MIndic presents passive **tīrati* and **dīrati* (= Skt. *tīryate*, *dīryate*). Formally similar, but active in meaning, is *kīrati* = *kirati* 'scatters'.

Miscellaneous non-Sanskrit passives

37.29. There remain a rather miscellaneous number of passive formations not known to normal Skt.; some, at least, are definitely MIndic in character. On the anomalous *jīvati* for *jīyate* see Dict. and § 2.31.

37.30. The root *kṣan* (*kṣaṇ*) 'wound, injure' seems to have no passive recorded in Skt. In Śikṣ 187.8 (prose) occurs *kṣaṇyate* 'is injured'; and with active endings (§ 37.14) *kṣaṇyema*, *kṣaṇyati*, Śikṣ 92.1 and 3.

37.31. The Skt. passive of *śaṃs* 'praise' is *śasyate*. In Mv i.88.8 (vs) all mss. have *praśaṃsyate* 'is praised', and Senart reads so also in 11 below, where however all mss. lack the anusvāra. If the form is not a mere corruption, it is a passive based on the thematic present, but hardly to be described as normal MIndic (which would give *praśaṃsīyati* or the like). Similarly *saṃstaryetsu(ḥ)* Mv i.235.17 (mss.) may be understood as 3 pl. aor. to **saṃstaryate*, a passive to *saṃstarati*. Senart em. *saṃstarayensu*, but a passive seems called for; meter obscure.

37.32. Perhaps phonetic corruptions, or else simplifications of consonant clusters involving MIndic assimilation of *y* after consonants, are *pṛcchasi* 'thou art asked', for *pṛcchyase*, Mv i.280.5 (vs); and *adhyeṣanti* 'they are invited (to give instruction)', for *adhyeṣyante* (or more strictly 'correct' Skt. *adhīṣyante*), Mv i.106.12 (vs); Senart em. *adhyeṣyanti*, but the form may represent a MIndic **ajjhēsati* for **ajjhessati* = **adhyeṣyate*. It may also be a mere corruption, as Senart assumes; or even an instance of a middle form (used in passive sense) with active ending (but no metrical compulsion can be involved here).

37.33. For *janeyā*, conceivably for **janīyeyā* 'would be produced' (cf. Pischel 535 *vejja* etc.), see § 8.36, where another interpretation is given.

37.34. Laṅk 24.17 (vs; and similarly 33.8; 203.13) *samādhyate* seems to be a quasi-denominative, passive, to the noun *samādhi*, which immediately precedes the phrase *samādhyate kathaṃ cittaṃ*, 'how is the thought concentrated?'.

37.35. In LV 195.20 (vs) *māṃ saṃpaśyī sarvalokai(ḥ) stuvantaṃ*, 'you shall see me being praised by all the worlds (people)', *stuvantaṃ* certainly has passive meaning (confirmed by Tib., *ḥjig rten kun gyis ṅa la bstod pa mthoṅ*, 'see praise to me by all the world'). The Pkt. passive of *stu* is *thuvvai* but AMg. at least once records *thuvanti*, for which Pischel 536 (see also 473) would read *thuvv*°. Is *v* for *vv* m.c.? Or have we a blend of MIndic (Pkt.) *thuvvai* and the alternative *thuvijjai*? I should hesitate to class the form baldly as an active used for passive, though formally it can be called a quite normal active pres. pple., acc. sg. masc.; cf. § 37.19. In any case the meter confirms the correctness of the LV reading.

37.36. On the other hand, I am inclined to regard the spelling *śruyati*, sometimes (e. g. ii.31.3; 427.14; iii.67.6, all prose, no v.l.) recorded in Mv for *śrūyate* (Pali *suyyati*, Pkt. *suvvai*), as a mere miswriting for *śrū*°; it seems to me that in Senart's place I should have emended.

37.37. On the passive suffix *ya* added to a reduplicated present stem see *abhinirmimīyantaṃ*, § 37.15. More questionable is *anudadhyamāna* (see Dict.), perhaps a passive pple. to *anu-dhā*.

37.38. Definitely MIndic is *hāyate* as passive to *hā*, instead of *hīyate*, 'wanes, declines, becomes deficient' (= Pali *hāyati* beside *hīyati*): *kiṃ hāyate tava* 'what is lacking to you?' Mv i.147.1, 5 = 203.16, 204.3 = ii.7.12, 18 (vs); *hāyante* SP 177.2, 4 (vs), so Kashgar rec. and 1 Nep. ms., others *hīyante*; fut. *hāyiṣyanti* Mv i.241.18 (vs); *hāyiṣyati* Mv i.44.4 (vs). It is analogous in formation to Skt. *jñāyate*, *khyāyate*, *dhmāyate*, *ghrāyate*, and a few others. Of different and problematic origin, is *nirdhāyate* or °*ti* (root *dham*?); Dict.

37.39. Somewhat similar to *hāyate* for *hīyate* is *vikrāyate* instead of *vikrīyate*, a passive to *vi-krī* 'sell' (possibly patterned on *hāyate* = *hīyate*? no other possible origin has occurred to me). It seems to have existed in AMg., which records a present passive pple. *vikkāyamāṇa* 'being sold'. In Mv ii.241.20 we must apparently assume an opt. of this: *vikrāyetsuḥ* 'would be sold'. So one ms.; the other *vikrāmayensuḥ*; Senart em. *vikrīyensuḥ*. And in Mv ii.242.14 we should probably read *vikrāyiṣyati* 'will be sold' (Senart *vikrayiṣyati* with one ms., the other *vikrāmāṣyati*); in Mv ii.242.11 *vikrāsyati* (v.l. *vikrāmasyati*), on which see § 31.3. In Pkt. (JM.) there is even recorded a pres. act. pple. *vikkanta* (Sheth), possibly pointing to an active **vikrāti*, or **vikrati*; the former could be a back formation from *vikrāyate* or *vikrāsyati*, the latter might be modelled on *vikreti* (§ 28.49), a case of an *ati* present instead of an *eti* present (§§ 38.3, 25 ff.). But I have found no such active form in our language.

38. Stems in aya (e); Causative, Denominative, etc.

38.1. It is well recognized (Pischel 472) that in Prakrit, presents in *e(t)i* are freely formed by the side of presents in *a(t)i*, without difference of meaning. The same process occurs in Pali (Geiger 139.2), tho less commonly.

38.2. The most important source of this phenomenon was, I believe, first suggested by Tedesco, JAOS 43.388, and later independently by M. Leumann, IF 57.212. Past participles in *ita*, to some extent even in Sanskrit (for whatever historic reasons), and much more regularly in MIndic (§ 34.7 ff.), are associated with presents in *ati* (as well as with those in *ayati*). So, even in Vedic, we find such forms as ppp. *rakṣita, patita, likhita*, to *rakṣati, patati, likhati*; and in later Skt. e. g. *vadita* to *vadati*, and many others. But since the *ita* ppp. was regularly associated with presents in *ayati*, new presents in *ayati* or MIndic *e(t)i* are analogically formed to such participles. A familiar example is *vadeti* 'speaks', found all over the MIndic field and in BHS; it means precisely the same as *vadati*, and was surely based on *vadita*. A list of such BHS forms is given below, §§ 38.18 ff.

38.3. Leumann (l. c.) pointed out that the converse substitution of *ati* for historic *eti* forms also occurs quite commonly in MIndic. This fact has not been so generally recognized. It is however a natural, almost predictable, result of the frequent occurrence of the equivalent types *vadeti*: *vadati*. Hence e. g. AMg. *māranti* 'they kill', by the side of *mārenti* = Skt. *mārayanti*. BHS has many such forms, including *mārase* = *mārayasi*. See §§ 38.25 ff. The role of the ppp. here is interestingly illustrated by *samudānita*, ppp. of *samudānayati* (°*neti*), replacing Skt. (*samud*)*ānīta*. This was obviously formed to the present *samudāneti* or °*nayati* by analogy with the many presents in *eti* or *ayati* with ppp. in *ita*. There is also a ger. *samudāniya* (as well as *apaniya*); see § 3.43. I have found no *a*-present like **samudānati*; but some such form seems presupposed by the noun *samudānana*, 'acquisition' (Dict.).

38.4. Not a few Skt. *aya* forms, often called 'causatives', are apparently indistinguishable in meaning from corresponding *ati* presents. Some of these are also indistinguishable in form from them, except that *-aya-* takes the place of *-a-*. So by the side of *rakṣati* 'guards' (V +), Classical Skt. has (rarely) *rakṣayati*, called 'causative', but meaning also simply 'guards'. This rare form seems almost certainly based on the ppp. *rakṣita* (V +), just like the MIndic *eti* presents. So with many so-called 'causatives used in the sense of the simple verb'.

38.5. But not with all. Sometimes other formal criteria distinguish historic causatives from non-causatives, in Skt. One: the non-causative present may not have a stem in *-a-*. Two: it may have a different vowel in the root syllable. So *kārayati*, originally or at least usually 'causes to make' or 'to be made', is distinguished in both these ways from the regular Skt. present *karoti*. Even this *kārayati*, however, is sometimes used in Skt. without causative meaning, that is like the simple verb. See Lang. 22.94–5, with notes 1 and 3, where such forms are discussed.

38.6. A causative based on a simple transitive may take an acc. either of the person or of the thing (or of both). That is, *kārayati* may mean 'causes (some one) to do (something)', or 'causes (something) to be done, gets (it) done'; the last must sometimes have been hard to distinguish from 'does (that thing)'. Perhaps that is why *kārayati*, even in Skt. (BR s.v. 7), sometimes cannot be distinguished in meaning from *karoti*. On the other hand, some such forms may not be historic causatives at all, but at best homonyms of causatives. They may, for instance, be denominatives. Everyone recognizes that *ghātayati* (B +) must have been a denominative to the noun *ghāta*; yet it functions as causative to *hanti* (root *han*). Its origin is recognizable because it happens not to coincide in pattern with bases of the standard causative type. But a noun *kāra* (very common in Skt. as final in compounds, hardly in use otherwise) might have formed a denominative *kārayati*, which no one could distinguish from the causative in form, but which might well have the same meaning as *karoti* — or also the meaning of a causative to it. It actually has both meanings in Sanskrit. (I am not, of course, expressing any belief that *kārayati* actually originated as a denominative; I *only* say that such a form *might* have had that origin.)

38.7. And finally, analogical influence from forms which, for any of the above reasons, have the formal aspect of causatives but no causative meaning, may have led to the use of other (genuinely historic) causatives with non-causative meaning. A list of apparent formal causatives with the meaning of the simplex in BHS will be given below, § 38.23.

38.8. Whatever the reasons may be, BHS shows an even more confused and intricate interplay of stems in *-a-*, on the one hand, and *-aya-* (or *-e-*) on the other, than is suggested by the statements about Pali and Prakrit in the standard treatments. Whether more searching studies in MIndic dialects would make them seem closer to BHS, I cannot say with confidence.

Causatives in *ayati*

38.9. To begin with, the suffix *aya* (or *e*) still lives as a productive causative-forming suffix, as in Skt. (despite the far greater prevalence of *āpaya*, which we shall treat below). Only, in BHS this *aya* is, like other verbal morphemes, added to the thematic present stem (minus final *a*), not to the Skt. 'root'. So also, at least occasionally, in Pali (Geiger 179, end: *nacceti, laggeti*, to *naccati, laggati*). Hence:

Root *kram*: *abhiniṣkramayati*, implied by ppp. °*mita*, to °*mati*, *na kadācin mayā kumāra udyānabhūmim abhiniṣkramitaḥ* LV 187.3–4 (prose), 'I have never allowed the prince to go out into the pleasure-park'. (Skt. has simple *kramayati*, to be sure, tho *krāmayati* is commoner; but it has no caus. of *abhi-niṣ-kram*, and our form is surely a non-Skt. creation.)

kṣubhayanti LV 339.13 (vs), caus. to Pali (*saṃ-*)*khubhati* (cf. ppp. Skt. *kṣubhita*, AMg. *khuhia*).

gṛhṇayām āsa, 'caused to grasp', Mmk 599.10 (vs), implying *gṛhṇayati*, caus. to *gṛhṇati* (§ 28.5).

ghṛ: *parighareti*, 'moistens round about', Mv iii.301.17 (prose; so with mss., Senart em. °*ghār*°), caus. to *-gharati* (see Chap. 43).

cint: *anuvicintayitāḥ*, see § 34.9.

chid: *chindayati*, 'causes to be cut off', Mmk 395.14, 18 (prose). Not = *chindati* 'cuts off' (cf. § 28.4), but caus. to it, as shown by parallel verbs in 18, *dālayati pācayati śoṣayati utsādayati* (all caus.).

jalp: *jalpesi* Mv ii.165.3 'ordered to say'.

jāgṛ: *pratijāgarayetvā* (one ms., § 35.26) Mv i.324.8, 'having had (food) prepared'.

paṭ: *paṭita*, 'torn', Mv i.5.8 (prose), certainly caus. in meaning (cf. *vipāṭīyantān*, pres. pass. pple. of caus., same line). Skt. has only caus. *pāṭayati*, 'rends', except a single instance of *paṭati*, 'sich spalten' (pw). A *paṭayati*, caus. to this, seems implied by *paṭita*; perhaps the same word Deśīn. 6.12 *padia*, defined by *vighaṭita*.

paśyayanti, 'they cause to be seen, display', Dbh.g. 48(74).26, to *paśyati*, 'sees'.

bharayitvā, 'having caused to be hired', SP 105.11 (prose), to *bharati*, 'hires'.

muñcayiṣya, 'I shall cause to send forth', Sukh 8.16 (vs), to *muñcati* (but not certainly caus., perhaps 'I shall send forth', in that case = *muñcati*).

vid, 'find': *vindayanti*, 'they cause to find', LV 242.7 (vs; text °*ntī*, but certainly 3 pl.; best ms. °*nti*), to *vindati*.

vṛ, 'cover': *prāvarayantyā*, 'by the (nun) who is making (the novice) dress', Bhīk 11a.5 (prose), to BHS *prāvarati*, 'puts on (clothes)'.

śī: for *śayāyito* read *śayāpito*, § 38.53.

sad: *niṣīdayati*, 'causes to sit', Divy 295.14 (prose); LV 70.21 (prose); *niṣīdayiṣyāmaḥ* Divy 420.25 (prose); to *niṣīdati*, 'sits down'.

sphṛ: *parispharayati* Mvy 1649, caus. to *-spharati* (Pali *paripphamati*).

svap: *supeti*, 'puts to sleep', Mv ii.423.7; 433.12; *supiya*, ger., 'having put to sleep', LV 50.4; to BHS *supiti*, Pali *supati*, 'sleeps'.

hā: *vijahayya*, ger., 'having caused to leave', Bhīk 15a.5, implying *vijahayati* (cf. Whitney 1051d), caus. to *vijahati*.

Causatives in *aya* from passive stems

38.10. Based on a historic present passive are Pali *tīreti* 'accomplishes', BHS ppp. *nis-tīrita* 'accomplished' Dbh 3.20 (prose), implying *tīrayati*, caus. to **tīrati*, not recorded in Pali or BHS but = Pkt. *tīrai*, clearly = Skt. *tīryate*, pass. to *tarati* (Geiger 175.2; Pischel 537). Skt. *nistarati* means 'accomplishes'; Skt. *nistīryate*, BHS (MIndic) **nistīrati* 'is accomplished'; caus. *nistīrayati* (implied by *nistīrita*), 'causes to be accomplished', thus finally = *nistarati*. The form defies any other interpretation (PTSD calls *tīreti* 'caus. to *tarati*', which of course is unsatisfactory).

38.11. This is confirmed by other cases, such as *kāma alabhamāna dahyayante*, LV 242.7 (vs), 'desires when not obtained cause (a person) to be burned'. Here *dahyayante* can only be a caus. to *dahyate*, pass., 'is burned'. It is true that Whitney, Roots, cites as Epic a 4th class present *dahyati* 'burns'. But he undoubtedly was relying on BR's citation (under *dah*, pass.) *dahyema*, trans., 'verbrennen', Mbh. 4.799. But the Crit. ed. 4.22.7 shows that this is a mere corruption, not found in any ms. there cited; Crit. ed. reads *dahyeta* 'would be burned', a true passive.

38.12. Another such case is *pithiyeyāsi* (mss.) Mv iii.25.6 'you are to cause to be covered', 2 sg. opt. caus. (**pithiyeti*) to *pithiyati*, pass. to *pithayati* or *pithati* 'covers' (Dict.).

38.13. The MIndic caus. suffix *-āpaya-* (below) may similarly be added to a passive stem, if (as I believe) we may adopt the reading *uddhvasyāpayitvā* Śikṣ 57.6 (Dict.), 'having caused to be insulted', to *uddhvasyate* 'is insulted'. And a stray Pali form noted in Geiger 181 seems to belong here: Milp. 90.11 *chejjapessāmi* (read surely *chejjā*°; Geiger says 'zu erwarten wäre *chijjā*°') seems probably based on some sort of passive, whether *chejjati* = Skt. *chedyate* (pass. to caus. *chedayati*), or, following Geiger's hint, *chijjati* = Skt. *chidyate*.

Causative with long *ā* for *a* in root-syllable

38.14. In a few cases, BHS shows causatives containing *ā* in the root syllable, where Skt. either shows short *a*, or has no such form at all. These seem to be analogical to Skt. causatives with long radical *ā*, which are the regular type: e. g. *vādayati*, caus. to *vadati*. It is worth noting that MIndic and BHS have also *vadeti* (non-caus.) = *vadati* (§ 38.21); this differs formally from *vādeti* (= *vādayati*), caus., only in the quantity of the root vowel. The existence of pairs of this sort seems, in a few forms, to have brought about lengthening of *a* to *ā* in the root-syllable, as a mark of the causative. I can see no other way of explaining *niṣpālāyitā* Bhīk 28b.1, 'she that has been caused to flee' or 'banished', ppp. to a **niṣpālāyati*, 'banishes', caus. to *niṣpalāyati*, 'flees, runs away'. Pali has *paleti* by the side of *palāyati* (Geiger 139); this would be to caus. **pāleti* (**pālāyati*) as *vadeti* to caus. *vādeti*.

38.15. In Skt., *janayati*, 'begets', and its compounds have only short *a* in the root syllable. So far as I can discover, only *jaṇei* (and the like) is recorded in Pkt., too; and according to Geiger 178.2b, only *janeti* in Pali But this last statement is questionable. An aor. *saṃjānesuṃ* occurs (to be sure, with v.l. °*jan*°) in Dhp. comm. iii.251.8. And a noun of agent, nom. sg., *saṃjānetā* occurs SN iii.66.16 (repeated in Index), tho PTSD would emend to *saṃjanetā*, which is in fact read in the same passage SN i.191.2. In any event, there is no doubt that BHS repeatedly shows *jānayati* for Skt. *jan*°: *saṃjānayati* Gv 502.23 (prose); *jānayi* (1 sg. opt.) Bhad 45; *upajānaya* (impv.) Mv ii.135.4 (vs); *saṃjānayiṣyanti* LV 439.4 (prose; v.l. °*jan*°); gerunds *jānayitvā* Mv ii.131.10 (prose), *saṃjānayya* LV 137.19 (prose); ppp. *jānitaḥ* Gv 381.17.

38.16. Note also ger. *vighāṭya*, 'having opened' (*muṣṭim*, 'the clenched fist'), Divy 280.9 (prose); the caus. of *vi-ghaṭ* in Skt. seems recorded only as *vighaṭayati* (pw 'zerreissen, trennen, zerstreuen; vereiteln, zu Nichte machen'; meanings somewhat different from that of our word), while AMg. *vihāḍei* 'opens', is probably identical with the BHS verb. To be sure Skt. has *udghāṭayati*, 'opens', from the same root with another preverb.

38.17. Divy 77.20 (mss.) and 466.16 *ucchrāyitaḥ* should doubtless be read *ucchrāpitaḥ* (Chap. 43, s.v. *śri*).

Verbs in *ayati* (*eti*) = *ati*

38.18. It will be convenient to list next the instances noted in which *eti*, or its Sanskritized equivalent *ayati*, and forms based thereon, occur apparently as precise synonyms of forms based on *ati* (§ 38.2). Any sort of *ati* (or middle *ate*) present may thus be replaced by *ayati* or *eti*. Even passives are so treated, sometimes with retention of medio-passive endings: *ghuṣyayante*, *saṃvidyayante* (below). In BHS, forms in *-aya-* are, at least in the present system, rather more common than those in *-e-*. But it is impossible to separate them; the same list will include both.

38.19. Most of the examples presented below are forms belonging to the old Skt. present system: present indicatives, imperatives, participles, and (of the *aya* type) optatives. There are included also a few gerunds, gerundives, and infinitives. Of futures of this type I have noted below *abhisaṃbuddheṣya*, *muñcayiṣya*, *vaheṣyaṃ* (all 1 sg. fut.); for others see § 31.9. Aorists in *esi* certainly belong here in so far as they are not based on old presents in *eti* (*ayati*), but rather on original *ati* presents; such cases are

fairly numerous and will be found in §§ 32.66, 67. Whether, or to what extent, the substitution of *eti* for *ati* presents was influential in the establishment of the aorist type ending in *-e(t)*, *-etsu(ḥ)* and the like, is not so clear; these forms seem primarily borrowed from the optative; see § 32.86.

38.20. There are even cases in which a stem retaining *aya* in that form is provided with an ending containing stem-final *e*, yielding a blended stem-form *-aye-*. Thus *dhārāpayehi* 'cause to hold' Mv ii.447.14 (prose; so mss., Senart em. °*paye*); § 30.5. Similarly aorists in *ayesi* will be found in § 32.66, and past participles in *ayita* in § 34.8.

38.21. The forms are listed alphabetically by 'roots'. Those occurring in prose are so marked; it will be noted that they are fairly numerous. Moreover, in many of those occurring in verses the *e* or *aya* was certainly not, or not chiefly, due to metrical convenience.

āp: *prāpuṇehi* Mv iii.270.14, to *prāpuṇati*. So the mss.; Senart em. °*āhi*. In line 16 Senart *prāpuṇāhi* with one ms.; the other °*ehi*.

ās: *adhyāsayati*, 'sits upon' = *adhyāste*, LV 18.8 (prose); *samupāsayante*, 'they revere' Dbh.g. 41(67).9.

iṣ: *icchesi* Mv ii.483.8 (in the same line *kāmasi* for *kāmayasi* or *kāmesi*, § 38.28; both may be m.c.); *pratīcchayantī* Mmk 65.12 (prose). Acc. to BR 5.1145, *icchayāmi* once = *icchāmi*, Rām. (but in the late Book 7). — *adhyeṣayāmi* = *adhyeṣāmi*, 'I ask for instruction', Laṅk 7.13, 15 etc., see Dict.

īkṣ: *nirīkṣayātha*, 'look!' LV 50.10; *samudīkṣayanto* LV 134.4.

utkaṇṭh(-*ati*, denom.): *utkaṇṭhehi*, 'grieve' Mv iii.167.9 (prose). Not an *aya* present regularly; cf. *utkaṇṭhantasya* in preceding line.

kamp: *kampayati*, 'quakes' (intrans., subject 'the earth') Mv iii.341.7 (prose; thrice in this line; in line 9 *kampati*, same mg.).

kāṅkṣ: *ākāṅkṣayatha* (impv.) Sukh 99.6 (prose).

kṛ 'make': *vikurvayato* Gv 267.3 (= *vikurvantaḥ*).

kṛ 'scatter': *prakireti* Mv ii.252.1, 16 (prose); *prakirentasya* (pres. pple.) id. ii.253.10 (prose); *prakirenti* id. i.211.20 (prose; in the context, and in the parallel ii.15.17 ff., *prakiranti* repeatedly); *okirenti* id. ii.304.3; *vikirayamāṇān*, 'cleaving' Gv 87.8; 89.11 (both prose). Pali also has *pakireti*, wrongly called 'Caus.' in PTSD; it means exactly the same as *pakirati*.

kṛṣ: *avakarṣayanti*, 'they remove' SP 159.12 (prose); *parikarṣayati*, 'carries around' Divy 475.14 (prose). In Skt. *karṣayati* (simplex) seems used in the same sense as the active *karṣati*.

kḷp: *kalpenti* Mv i.135.1, 10 (prose) 'are adapted, serve', intrans., = *kalpante*.

kram: *ākramesi* Mv ii.408.18 (mss. *parākramesi*, hypermetric; the form might, however, be opt.); *upakramemi* Mv ii.459.16 (prose); *parākrametum* LV 134.2; *atikrametum* LV 134.7; *avakrāmayati* = *avakrāmati*, 'enters into (a mental state)' LV 400.14 (prose; same passage *okrāmetvā* Mv iii.318.15).

krī: *kriṇenti* Mv i.91.10 (so 5 mss., Senart with 1 ms. *kriṇanti*) = *krīṇanti*.

krīḍ: *krīḍayanti* LV 75.17 = *krīḍanti*; *krīḍayantam* LV 157.7 (prose).

kṣip: *nikṣipayitvā* (*kamaṇḍaluṃ*) = *nikṣipya* Mv i.241.1 (*nikṣipetva* would be metrically better); *nikṣipetvā* id. ii.65.4 (prose; so mss., Senart em. °*pitvā*).

khan: *anukhaneti parikhaneti*, 'digs up to,—around' Mv iii.301.16 (prose).

gam: *āgametu* Mv iii.263.17 (prose; based on stem of what in Skt. is 'thematic aorist', here blended with thematic pres.); *āgamehi* Mv ii.31.20; iii.161.10; 186.17 (all prose); *āgamaya* 'come!' Divy 76.10 = 465.10 (prose); MSV i.3.12; 24.8, etc.; *āgamayata* Divy 534.12 (prose); *gacchayamī* = *gacchāmi* LV 223.1; *gacchehi* Mv i.187.1 (Senart em. °*āhi*).

garh: *vigarhayitavyā(ḥ)* Divy 115.7 (prose).

gāh: *vigāhayamānaḥ* Bhad 39. This and *vipaśyayamānaḥ* (below, s.v. *paś*) are parallel to *viśodhayamānaḥ* and *vimocayamānaḥ*, and are made to fit them in meter and rhythm. But *vigāhayamāna*, for *vigāhamāna*, occurs also Gv 476.4.

grah: *pragṛhṇetvā* Mv iii.131.4 (prose; v.l. *pragṛhītvā*), to *pragṛhṇati*; *pratigṛhṇehi* Mv iii.211.10.

ghuṣ: *ghuṣyayante* LV 92.6 'are resounded', to passive *ghuṣyate*.

car: *caresi* = *carasi* Mv ii.187.23; *vicaresi* = °*rasi* id. ii.321.21 (both these might be m.c.); *carayesi* (2 sg. opt., § 29.21) *brahmacaryam*, 'live thou the religious life' (= *cara* or *careḥ*) Mv ii.42.18 (mss. *vara*°).

chid: *chindaya*, 'cleave!' Suv 133.8 (= *chinda*, Skt. *chinddhi*).

jṛmbh: *vijṛmbheti*, 'yawns' = °*bhati* Mv ii.281.7 ff. (prose).

jñā: *anujānaye* Mv i.257.11 (prose) 'I authorize', = *anujāne*; in repetition of same, line 18, *anujāneyam*, opt. of *anujānati*; Pali *anujāneti* recorded only as caus. — *parijānayeyā* LV 330.17 = *parijāneyā*, Skt. °*jānīyāt*. — *prajānayanti* Sukh 9.8 = *prajānanti*.

dham: *vidhamaye* (2 sg. opt.) LV 117.6 (Pali also *vidhameti* = *vidhamati*).

dhṛ: *dharesi* (2 sg. pres.) Mv i.210.1 = ii.13.21 (prose); i.210.9 = ii.14.8 (vs); cf. *dhāremi*, response to i.210.1, in verse i.210.3. To BHS and Pali *dharati* (Skt. *dhārayati*, which may have influenced this form—a sort of blend of *dharasi* and *dhārayasi*?).

nam: (*cittaṃ*) *namayati* LV 398.1 (prose) (the Tathāgata's) 'mind turned' (towards indifference); = *namate* or *namati*, intrans. — *praṇamayya*, 'bowing' (? = *praṇamya*; see Dict. s.v. *praṇamati*) Av i.347.4; ii.3.9; Divy 463.22 (all prose; the last doubtful).

namasya (denom.): *namasyayanti*, 'pay homage' LV 119.2 = *namasyanti*.

pad: *samāpadyetum* Mmk 514.24; *pratipadyetum* id. 540.28 (both prose); *upapadyesi*, § 32.67.

paś: *vipaśyayamānaḥ* Bhad 39; see above s.v. *gāh*; *paśyehi* Mv i.187.4 (Senart em. °*āhi*).

pṛcch: *pṛcchenti* Mv i.256.10 (prose); *paripṛcchesi* id. ii.298.3 (prose, v.l. °*asi*). [Note: *pṛccheti* SP 16.7 is taken by Burnouf and Kern as = *pṛcchati*. But as WT say it is rather *pṛccha-iti*: *pṛccheti maitreya jinasya putra spṛhenti te* ... 'Saying, "Ask!" Maitreya, son of the Jina, these ... are eager' (to hear the answer given to your question).]

bandh: *bandhesi* Mv ii.483.7 = iii.18.10; *bandhayitvā* Mv ii.168.6 (prose; subject is a policeman, object a suspected criminal); *anubandheti* = °*ati*, 'follows' Mv iii.294.19; (*sam*)*anubandhayatām*, 'let him follow' LV 46.2 and 12 (probably m.c., since *anubandhatām* occurs elsewhere in the context, e. g. line 8); *anubandhayāmaḥ* LV 47.7, 21 and 48.7.

budh: *abhisaṃbuddheṣya* (1 sg. fut.) Mv ii.404.19 (ms.; prose), to present °*buddhati* (§ 31.33).

bhañj: *prabhañjayitvā*, 'having broken' SP 159.1 (prose).

bhaṇ: *bhaṇesi* = *bhaṇasi* Mv ii.222.19 (also Pkt. *bhaṇei*).

bhāṣ: *adhyabhāṣaye* Mv iii.327.5 (prose) = the much commoner *adhyabhāṣe* (3 sg. aor.); see further Chap. 43, s.v. *bhāṣ* (2).

bhid: *bhindayitvanā* (so read with v.l. for text *bhindiy*°), ger., LV 73.21.

man: *abhimanyayāmaḥ*, 'we desire' = °*manyāmaḥ* LV 49.11; *manesi*, *manayase* (?), see Chap. 43, s.v. *man* (2).

mīmāṃsa (desid.): *mīmāṃsaye* (*ti*) Av i.94.3 (prose). So divide, with Feer, supported by Tib.; 1 sg. pres. mid.; *ti* = *iti*; misunderstood and wrongly em. by Speyer. So

also Av i.189.4 (prose), read with mss. *mīmāṃsayeyaṃ*, 1 sg. opt.

muc: *muñcayantaḥ* Megh 308.13 (prose); *muñcayiṣya* (1 sg. fut.) Sukh 8.16.

mūrch: *saṃmūrchayitvā*, 'having fainted' LV 234.2.

mṛ: *marenti* (= Pali, BHS *maranti*) 'die' Gv 213.20.

yāc: *yācesi* (= *yācasi*) Mv ii.185.9; *yācintyā(ḥ)* (*i* for *e*, § 3.49) = *yācentyāḥ* = Skt. *yācantyāḥ* (gen. sg. pres. pple.) Mv i.133.1 (prose).

ruc: *virocenti*, 'shine' = °*canti* Mv i.78.12 (prose); just below, line 14, *abhirocante* is used with transitive (causative) mg., 'illumine'.

rud: *rodayāmi*, 'I weep' Mv iii.351.9 (prose, no v.l.; below in line 13 *rodāmi*).

lap: *ālapeti*, 'speaks' LV 236.2 (and see Dict. s.v. *lapayati*, 'boasts').

labh: *labhenti* Śikṣ 336.8 (from Ratnolkādhāraṇī).

vad: *vadayati*: 'says' Mv ii.237.18 (prose); *vadeti* SP 197.4; KP 81.10; *vademi* SP 59.2; LV 335.15; Mv i.292.16; iii.110.13 (mss.); 371.21; 372.2 (all vss; but note *vadāmi* iii.371.17); i.8.14; ii.418.8, 9; 430.15; iii.51.17; 447.16 (all prose); *vadesi* SP 93.11; Mv iii.110.21; 195.1 (this prose); 371.9 ff.; *vadenti* i.256.11 (prose); *vadehi* i.324.10; 330.12; iii.159.4; 173.18; 205.10 (all prose). Common in Pali and most Prakrits, as well as in BHS.

vand: *vandenti* Mv i.256.10 (prose).

vas: *vasayathā*, 'rest' (= *vasata*, impv.) LV 202.5 (see Dict.); *vasayāmi*, 'I dwell' (= *vasāmi*) Divy 212.4, 6 (prose); *āvasehi* Mv ii.405.9.

vah: *vaheti* Mv ii.228.1 (v.l. *vahati*, but meter seems to support *vaheti*); *vaheṣyaṃ* (1 sg. fut.) Mv ii.236.13 (prose).

vid: passive *saṃvidyayanta* (*ime*), i. e. °*nte*, = *saṃvidyante*, 'are on hand', 'are provided' LV 115.9.

vṛt: *nivartayasva*, 'turn back!' (intrans.) LV 225.12 (prose); *mā nivartayatha*, 'do not return!' LV 228.8 (prose); *nivartehi* Mv ii.105.8.

vedh (MIndic): *pravedhayamānaḥ* (so with best mss.), 'trembling' LV 188.3 (prose). Both this cpd. and the simplex *vedhati* regularly show *ati*, not *ayati*, forms in Pali and BHS; and this is certainly not caus.

śās: *śāsayitavyaḥ*, 'to be punished' Divy 243.28 (prose); *samanuśāsehi* Mv ii.103.14 (prose). Pali *anusāseti*, beside °*ati*.

śru: *śruṇehi* Mv iii.140.13, to *śruṇati*.

sad: *niṣīdayed*, 'would sit down' SP 344.1; *niṣīdeti gatamohā* Mv i.306.12 (so read with mss.; Senart em. *niṣīde vigatamohā*).

sev: *upasevehi* Mv ii.103.13 (prose).

stu: *stavayiṃsu*, 'they praised' LV 414.10 (vs), = (aor. to) BHS *stavati*.

sthā: *tiṣṭhayet* = *tiṣṭhet* Sādh 411.18 (vs); *anutiṣṭhayema* Mv iii.290.1 (prose; Senart with v.l. °*ṣṭhiy*°; °*ma* is Senart's em. for mss. °*sa* or °*śa*, and *anu* for *ava*), 'we would (may) experience or carry out'.

spṛś: *spṛśayitum*, 'to touch' Mv ii.65.14 (prose); inf. to *spṛśayati* = *spṛśati*.

sphṛ, *sphur*: *sphurayitvā*, 'pervading, suffusing' LV 113.2 (prose) = *sphuritvā* (to *sphurati*).

hṛ: *āhareti* Mv iii.201.5 (prose) = *āharati*, next line. In corresponding Pali passage *āhāreti* occurs repeatedly, e. g. DN ii.223.27. The object in both is *āhāram*, and PTSD regards *āhāreti* as denominative to this noun; *āhareti* could not be this. — *uddharetvā* Mv i.7.14 (prose).

Historic causatives with non-causative meaning

38.22. In the preceding list there is nothing but the infix *-aya-* (or MIndic *-e-*) to suggest association with causatives; and all such forms have the meaning of non-causatives in *-a-*. It is, however, worth noting that some of them are identical in form (allowing for MIndic phonological or morphological features which are here irrelevant) with *aya*-formations which in Sanskrit are recorded with causative meanings. This is true of *-īkṣayati*, *kampayati*, *-karṣayati*, *-kramayati* and *-krāmayati*, *kalpeti* (Skt. *kalpayati*), *-gamayati*, *-garhayati*, *-gāhayati*, *namayati*, *bandheti* (Skt. *bandhayati*), *-bhāṣayati*, *mūrchayati*, *yāceti* (Skt. *yācayati*), *-roceti* (*rocayati*), *rodayati*, *-vartayati*. Cf., even in Skt., such cases as *rakṣayati* = *rakṣati* (§ 38.4). Other influences which may have resulted in non-caus. function with what look like causatives were discussed in §§ 38.5–7.

38.23. Whatever the reasons may be, it seems clear that most, if not all, of the following list were historically causatives. They all differ from the preceding list in that other formal features than *-aya-* (*-e-*) identify them as such; usually the vowel of the root syllable. It is at most possible that in one or two cases historic denominatives are concerned (cf. § 38.6). All of them have non-causative meaning. (For a few Skt. causative stems in *-paya-* used in non-causative meaning see below, § 38.58.)

āp: *prāpayanti* 'they get' Mv i.30.15; 31.15 (both prose). Skt. *prāpayati* and Pali *pāpayati*, *pāpeti* seem recorded only as causatives. However, AMg. appears to have both *pāvei* and *pāvai* as non-caus. (Ratnach. 'to obtain, to get, to acquire'). If we could assume that **prāpati* (AMg. *pāvai*) was older than *prāpayati* (AMg. *pāvei*) as non-caus., 'gets', then the latter would be based on the former (which could be a MIndic analogical present), and this example would belong in the preceding list. It seems to me more likely that AMg. *pāvai* is secondary to *pāvei*, like the cases in §§ 38.25 ff.

diś: *uddeśenti* 'they point out (the way)' Mv i.21.3; 23.9 (both prose). Formally **uddeśayati* would be expected to have causative meaning. To be sure, it does not seem to be recorded anywhere; I find only Ap. *uddesai* (= **uddeśati*), Jacobi, Bhav. 162.9, used in the sense of the simplex *uddiśati*. If our Mv form is based on that Ap. form, it would belong in the preceding section.

nī: (*timiraṃ*) *apanāyayiṣyase* LV 365.3, 'you will dispel', in the sense of *apanayati*. Cf. Skt. caus. *nāyayati*. Does this mean literally 'you will cause to be dispelled'? Cf. § 38.5.

nud: *prativinodayati* (= Pali *paṭivinodeti*), 'dispels', is the regular form (and only one known to Pali); °*nudati* in one Divy verse, see Dict.

pat (?): see Dict. s.v. *vinipātayati*.

bhū: *abhisaṃbhāvayitvā* 'having attained' (object *tad-arthaṃ*) Mv i.4.12 (prose), in a formula found elsewhere, Mv ii.115.6; iii.90.18; 382.8. The sense is that of pre-Class. Skt. and Pali *abhisambhavati*, Pali and BHS *abhisaṃbhuṇāti* (°*ṇati*). The causative is recorded in BR only once in mg. 'begrüssen' from BhāgP.

vad: *vivādenti* 'quarrel' Mv i.10.12; = Skt. and Pali *vivadati*; but Pali also *vivādayati*, usually written *vivādiyati* and regarded by PTSD, perhaps rightly, as denom. to *vivāda*. This might be the explanation of our form; *vivādayati* is recorded in BR only as 'start a lawsuit' i. e. 'cause to dispute' (Yājñ.). But the form is probably a mere corruption; read *pi pāṭenti* with iii.455.6.

vah: (*ājñāṃ*) *prativāhayāmi* 'I disobey' Gv 122.8 (prose); = *prativahati*, q.v. (Dict).

viś: *praveśi* (ger.), 'having entered' (= *praviśya*) LV 243.11; *niveśayi* (aor.; *buddhadharme*), 'entered into' or 'rested in' LV 158.13; *praveśi* (aor.) Mv iii.162.5 (prose). In Skt. and Pali *-veśayati* is caus. only; acc. to Ratnach., AMg. *pavesei* is used in the same meaning as *pavisai*, 'to enter, to penetrate'.

vraj: *pravrājayeyaṃ* Gv 417.15 (prose) *yan nv ahaṃ bhagavato 'ntike pravrājayeyam*, 'suppose I now . . . enter the religious life'. For the converse, *pravrajati* = caus. *pravrājayati*, see § 38.24.

śru: *pratiśrāvayitum*, 'to heed, give ear to' (= *pratiśrotum*) Divy 207.7 (prose).

śliṣ: *saṃśleṣayet*, app. 'would embrace', SP 114.9; = *saṃśliṣyet*. So Burnouf; Kern 'conciliate'. Dhātup. gives *saṃśleṣayate* 'āliṅgane'.

sṛ: *avasāri* Mv i.319.14, 16, 20; 323.13, 16 (in 16 mss. *anusāri*); iii.47.12; as 1 sg. ii.117.20; 120.17; *avasāriṃ* (1 sg.) Mv ii.119.6; 123.16, 'came to, arrived at', apparently for *avasari(ṃ)*, which is read in corresponding passages in Pali, e. g. Vin. iii.11.30 (CPD s.v. *avasarati*). No present **sārati* seems to be recorded, and the forms (all in prose) certainly have no caus. mg., yet seem to be based on *ava-sārayati*. Perhaps *acāri* = *acārīt* may have influenced this form; § 32.19. But note also *anusāre* in prose Mv iii.101.16; this is not so easily understood as influenced by *acārīt* or the like.

On *nivāsayati* see Dict.; it does not belong here, tho PTSD wrongly defines *nivāseti* as if it were used as an intransitive. It has the same meaning as the same form in Skt.

Non-causative forms with causative meanings

38.24. The converse of the preceding group occurs more rarely. These must apparently due be to some analogy; perhaps to the much commoner replacement of *-ayati* (*-eti*) by *-ati* forms (below), which often means in effect replacement of causatives by their underlying non-causative forms (while retaining causative meanings). Hence, possibly, other primary non-causatives, which differ formally from their causatives in other respects than lack of *-aya-* (*-e-*), came to be used with causative meaning:

allīyati, regularly 'comes', but also 'brings', see § 38.67.

āpadyati Mv i.181.10 (vs), apparently 'fetches' (object *bhojanam*), = *āpādayati*; but only two mss. read so; the other four are clearly corrupt; perhaps the true reading was different.

utpadyema Mv i.365.10 (prose), apparently 'produce, cause', as if from *utpādayati*: *ye . . . heṭhām utp°*. No v.l. cited; but in parallels Mv ii.447.17; 448.7; 486.1; 489.3, forms of the caus. *utpād(ay)ati* are always used.

jahāti SP 61.8 (vs), *kāṅkṣāṃ ca śokaṃ ca jahāti prāṇinām* (subject *sugatāna ghoṣaḥ*, 'the voice of the Buddhas'). The most natural meaning seems to be 'dispels' or 'removes (doubt and sorrow of, i. e. for, or from, living beings)'; so Burnouf and Kern; and so Tib., *bsol.* This implies a sort of causative to the usual meaning, 'abandons'.

pravrajāhi māṃ Mv iii.386.13 (vs), 'make me a monk!' So one ms.; the other *prajāhi*, evidently a corruption for this. Senart em. *pravrājehi*, which is not only violent, but metrically impossible. Similarly, tho closer in form to the Skt. caus., *pravrajehi* Mv iii.268.5 (mss.; prose; caus., Senart em. °*vrāj*°); the impv. ending *ehi* is however often found in verbs which otherwise show no *aya* (*e*) forms (§ 30.5). And in Mv iii.379.11, for Senart's *pravrājehi*, one ms. has *pravrajehi* (the other *pravājehi*). Further support is afforded by *pravrajiṣyaṃ* Mv iii.268.6 (prose) 'I shall make a monk' (so mss.; Senart em. *pravrājayiṣyaṃ*); *pravrajetsuḥ* (mss.; Senart em. *pravrājensuḥ*; 3 pl. aor.) Mv i.323.9 (prose).

vilapiṣyase LV 335.3 (vs), 'you shall be made to howl', and *āmlāyiṣyase* LV 335.5 (vs), 'you shall be caused to wither', both with instr. *bodhisattvena*, apparently caus. in meaning. In the same context with *vivarjiṣyase, vitrāsiṣyase, prapātiṣyase, viśoṣiṣyase*, etc. (§ 38.31), which are normal causative forms except for lack of *-ay-*.

pratitiṣṭhe Mv iii.294.10 (vs), aorist; as Senart observes, must apparently be causative in mg., 'set, placed'. This gives support to SP 63.10 (vs) *pratiṣṭhihitvā*, which seems to mean 'firmly establishing' (so Kern), the object being *upāyakauśalya*; Burnouf 'grâce à leur habileté . . .', perhaps understanding *upāyakauśalya* in the sense of a locative? (This would be possible, § 8.11.)

Verbs in *ati* = *ayati* (*eti*)

38.25. As was pointed out above (§ 38.3), MIndic and BHS not infrequently replace stems in *ayati* by *ati*, without change of meaning. This is the converse of the substitution of *ayati* for *ati*, §§ 38.18 ff. Many of the forms in *ayati* thus displaced were historically causatives, and sometimes the substitute in *ati* has the form of the primary verb on which they were based. Such cases could be associated with the immediately preceding list, but since here the only formal difference is replacement of *-aya-* (*-e-*) by *-a-*, it seems best to list them with this much more extensive list, which includes denominatives, and presents in *-aya-* (*-e-*) of still other origins, for which *-a-* is substituted.

38.26. Tho paralleled in Prakrit, as we saw, this substitution is less common in our language than the opposite substitution of *ayati* for *ati*, except in certain formal categories such as the gerund and especially the optative. In the optative the mode-sign regularly contains *e*, and this leads to frequent telescoping of preceding *e* (*aya*) of the base (cf. § 29.4), resulting in forms like *tarpet* for *tarpayet*, *deśeyaṃ* for *deśayeyaṃ*, etc. For such reasons as this it will be more illuminating here to group examples by formal categories instead of by 'roots'. The list of optatives offers only a sampling and could be considerably extended; some other examples will be found in our chapter on the optative. The list of gerunds (on which cf. Lang. 13.113 note 4; also § 35.24, with references; they are MIndic new creations, not ancient inheritances) in *itvā* instead of *ayitvā* is also by no means exhaustive. This is, in fact, true of other sections of the following list. Prose cases are marked as such.

38.27. Optatives: Ending *e(t)*: *tarpet* 'would gratify' SP 126.14 = *tarpayet*; *dhāre* SP 255.10 (in same line with *dhāreti* = *dhārayati*) and 293.8; *śrāved* 'should recite' SP 229.7 = *śrāvayed*; *upasthape* (Kashgar rec. and WT) SP 88.12; *vācet* SP 342.4.

Ending *i* (m.c. for *e*): *praśami* Sukh 23.5, and *praśāmi* id. 23.6.

Ending *eta*: *dhāreta* SP 255.14, so read with La Vallée Poussin's Kashgar fragment JRAS 1911.1073; *deśeta* SP 282.6; *janeta* SP 250.16.

Ending *ema*: *vijñāpema* Mv i.360.5 (prose).

Ending *eyuḥ*: *katheyuḥ* (denom.) Sukh 74.18.

Ending *eran*: *ghāteran* 'they would kill' Laṅk 252.16 (prose) = *ghātayeran*.

Ending *eyaṃ*: *vineyaṃ* (= *vinayeyaṃ*) Mv i.337.8; *deśeyaṃ* Mv i.37.8; 60.6 (v.l. *deśayeyaṃ*); *pravarteyaṃ* Mv i.39.1 (v.l. °*tayeyaṃ*); 330.4; 331.3; *tāreyaṃ*, *āśvāseyaṃ* id. i.39.5 (in both v.l. °*ayeyaṃ*; the same sentence contains *mocayeyaṃ* and *parinirvāpayeyaṃ*; all the preceding are prose); *sthapeyaṃ* SP 128.2 (v.l. *sthapiṣye*); *prapūreyaṃ* Mv i.53.10 (in parallels i.42.9 and i.337.3 mss. *prapūrayeyaṃ* which Senart keeps in the latter, regarding this version as prose); *pramoceyaṃ* Mv i.42.17 (repeated 53.14 where mss. unmetrically °*cayeyaṃ*; so, unmetrically, all mss. also read in i.43.2 = 53.16); *vicaleyaṃ*, see Dict. s.v. *vicalayati*.

Endings *eya*, *eyā*: (verses) *kṣapeya* SP 111.14; *dhāreya* 229.6; *prakāśeyā* 237.2; *vijñapeyā* 284.8; *tarpeya* 351.4; *jareya* LV 74.3; *janeyā* 152.6; *darśeya* 284.5; *deśeya* 393.2; *śoṣeya* Mv ii.329.7; *grāheya* ii.330.18; *deśeya, moceya, tarpeya, pureya* (read *pūr*°), *śameya* Suv 37.7 ff.; (the rest are prose) *dāleya saṃpradāleya* Mv ii.125.4; *vipraveśeyā* ii.146.14; *viheṭheya* ii.178.7; *śobheya* iii.10.16.—Denominatives: (verses) *katheyā* SP 283.15; *gaṇeya* LV 338.7.—

From *vi-nayati*: *vineya* (for *vinayeya*) Mv i.43.4 = 54.2 = 337.8 (vs; printed as prose in the last place, where Senart moreover prints *vineyaṃ*, but one ms. reads *vineya*).

Ending *eyyā*: *prakāśeyyā* Mv i.336.20; *niveśeyyā* i.53.6 (mss.).

38.28. Present Indicatives: *kāmasi* = *kāmayasi* Mv ii.483.8; in the same line, conversely, *icchesi* for *icchasi* (§ 38.21); both favored by meter.

kilāmasi = *klāmayasi* Mv ii.483.9 (may be m.c.).

ghātanti = *ghātayanti* Mv i.27.8 (prose; so all mss.; Senart em. *ghātenti*). Cf. AMg. *ghāyae, ghāyāvaha, ghāyamāṇa* (Ratnach.).

chādante (read °*ti*, m.c.) = *chādayanti* 'cover' Sukh 50.16.

deśate = *deśayati* Mv i.187.3 (perhaps m.c.); *deśati* Suv 19.4 (vs, but metr. indifferent); *deśantu* Suv 23.8 (cited as *deśentu* Śikṣ 217.1).

nāmanti = *nāmayanti* Śikṣ 324.18.

paripācati = °*pācayati* Śikṣ 325.2.

pāyanti 'they give to drink' Mv i.8.5 (prose), mss. for *pāyayanti* which Senart adopts by em.; Pali normally has *pāyeti*, but records a pres. pple. *pāyamānā* as if from *pāyate* (°*ti*). In a verse parallel to this passage, i.12.7, mss. *āyācanti* (except one °*centi*); I would read *āpāyanti* (Senart °*yenti*).

paripūrati (v.l. °*rayati*, but meter seems to demand °*rati*) Mv iii.356.6.

moce = *mocaye* (*mocayāmi*) LV 219.4.

pratisaṃmodate (see Dict.) Gv 53.14; °*dante* Bhīk 26b.4, 5 (all prose).

mārase = *mārayase* Mv i.179.18; AMg. *māranti* and the like.

rocanti 'they accept, approve' (*śāsanaṃ*) SP 306.4, = *rocayanti*, Pali *rocenti*; but AMg. *royai* etc. beside *roei* etc.; *abhirocante* 'they illumine' Mv i.78.14 = °*cayanti*; in line 12, just before, *virocenti* 'shine', intrans. (§ 38.21).

lālati 'coddles' = *lālayati* Mmk 35.5.

varṇanti (denom.) = *varṇayanti* LV 29.12.

vādataḥ (3 dual, = *vādayataḥ*) MSV iii.16.6.

vedati 'experiences, feels' = *vedayati*, Pali *vedeti*, Av i.243.12 (vs, but metr. indifferent); in later repetitions, e. g. 247.10, *vindati* is used. AMg. has *veyai, veyanti, vedanti* by the side of *eti* forms.

viśeṣanti 'distinguish' = *viśeṣayanti* Laṅk 357.1; 371.3 (in 371.2 the regular *viśeṣayet*).

38.29. Present Imperative (rare, except such cases as § 30.5): *saṃtāra* 'take across!' RP 49.15 (vs) = *saṃtāraya*.

38.30. Present Participles: *tāḍa*, m.c. for *tāḍan* = *tāḍayan*, LV 341.13.

vyāyāmantena 'exerting oneself' Mv ii.30.11 (prose). The long radical *ā* seems to prove that *vyāyāmayati* is the present concerned (not *vyāyamati*). It is not common; BR cite *vyāyāmya*, ger., from Manu, and Sheth cites *vāyāmento* (pres. pple.). It may be a denominative from *vyāyāma*.

iranta(*ḥ*) Gv 372.13 = *īrayantaḥ* with *i* for *ī* perhaps m.c. (but cf. pres. *iryati*; note also that *irentaḥ* would be as good metrically).

a-vilomanta (°*mata*) Dbh.g. 27(53).3; see Chap. 43, s.v. *vilomayati*.

sūcata Śikṣ 342.10; I understand this as for *sūcatā* (with *a* m.c.), instr. sg. pres. pple. to the denom. *sūcayati*.

38.31. Futures: SP (all vss) *darśiṣye* = *darśayiṣye* 237.9; *uccāriṣye* 237.10; *adhivāsiṣyāma* 271.10. — LV (all vss) *vivarjiṣyase* 333.14; *vitrāsiṣyase* 334.7; *prapātiṣyase* 334.9; *viśoṣiṣyase* 334.13; *udbhrāmiṣyase* 334.17; *rosiṣyase* 334.19; *tāriṣye* 361.4; *tāriṣyase* 361.6. — *parājiṣyāmi* Mv ii.314.17 (prose, no v.l.), 'I shall overcome', if textually sound, can only stand for *parājeṣyāmi*, or rather presumably MIndic (and sporadic Skt.) °*jayiṣyāmi*. — *pravrājiṣye* Divy 260.20 (prose; so mss., ed. em. °*jayiṣye*). — *prāpiṣya* (= *prāpayiṣyāmi*) Dbh.g. 12(348).11. — *svādhyāsyati* (and the same form repeatedly in this text) AsP 52.5, 21 (prose). The denom. *svādhyāyati* 'studies, repeats aloud' is common (see § 38.35 and Chap. 43), and all its forms are based on the stem *svādhyāya-* except this future, perhaps a passive opt. *svādhyāyeta* SP 391.7, and the gerundive *svādhyātavya* Samādh 22.8 (prose). It corresponds to Pali *sajjhāyati*. To the latter, Pali has two causatives (Geiger 188.1), *sajjhāpayati* (°*peti*) and *sajjhāyāpeti*, both meaning 'causes to study, teaches'. The first is formed according to our § 38.56, the second according to our § 38.53 (*sajjhāyati* being treated as an *a*-present). In our language this pair of equivalent causatives appears to have led, by proportional analogy, to the creation of an irregular future *svādhyāsyati* (and corresponding gerundive *svādhyātavya*; the passive opt., if sound, would perhaps be a further development of these forms, as if on a present *svādhyāti*), beside the regular *svādhyāyiṣyanti* (SP 478.7, prose). The formula is **svādhyāyāpeti* (*sajjhāyāpeti*): **svādhyāpeti* (*sajjhāpeti*) = *svādhyāyiṣyati*: x (*svādhyāsyati*).

38.32. Aorists: *samādapinsu* SP 51.8 (Kashgar rec.). — *snapinsu* LV 93.21, 22. — *praṇāmi* Mv iii.147.19; *pratimāne* (to *pratimānayati*) iii.248.12; *kathe* iii.408.15 (prose; to denom. *kathayati*; cf. *kathaye* iii.413.2). — *vijñapī* Samādh 8.22. — *darśi* 'displayed' Gv 254.25 (to *darśayati*); *nidarśi* Gv 255.6; *sthapī* Gv 383.17. — *toṣi* Śikṣ 346.6.

38.33. Gerunds: SP (all vss) *harṣitva* 25.7; *pāṭitva* 85.12; *bhāvitva* 92.8; 116.4; *vivarjitva* 99.4; *cintitva* 117.4 (text *cintetva*); *tāritva* 149.12; *prajñapitvā* 194.3; *pūjitva* 217.9; *choritva* 251.5. — LV (all vss) *janitva* 50.14; 422.4; *janitvā* 234.7; *upasthapitvanā*, 54.15, so read with v.l. for text °*pisva nā*. — Mv (all but the first prose) *parivarjitvā* Mv i.12.14; *pratisaṃmoditvā* i.273.10 (here Senart em. °*etvā*); ii.443.17; iii.450.20; *māritvā* ii.248.5; *veditvāna* (so with mss.; to *vedayati*) iii.61.11. — *pūritvana* KP 20.23 (vs; to *pūrayati*). — And many similar forms.

Denominatives

38.34. Denominative formations present little that is different in principle from Sanskrit denominatives. Attention may first be called to a considerable number of onomatopoetic formations, like the 'quasi-denominatives' noted in Whitney 1066c. Most of them are reduplicated: *khalakhalāyati*, *guḍāyati* (*guḍuguḍāyate*, *guluguláyati*, *gulugulayati*), *ghuṇaghuṇāyate*, *ciṭiciṭāyati* (°*te*, *ciṭac*°, *ciṭiciṭīyati*), *culuculāyati*, *tuṇatuṇāyati* (cf. *tuṇa*, noun), *pilipilipāyeti* (note pres. *-eti* after *-āy-*), *pharapharāyate*, *sarasarāyate*, *huduhuduyati*.

38.35. Of denominatives in simple *-ati*, without *-ya-* (Wh. 1054), among the few clear cases noted are *śiṣyate* 'learns' (Dict.), *praśnati* 'questions', *duḥkhati* 'hurts', and *svādhyāyati* 'studies' (§ 38.31), apart from forms based on past passive participles (§ 28.19). But in view of Pali *sukkhati*, the inf. *śuṣkitum* may be regarded as based on **śuṣkate* (or °*ti*) 'get dry' rather than **śuṣkayate*. — On the anomalous hyper-Skt. *niṣedyati* see Dict.

38.36. The usual Skt. formation in *-ayati* or *-āyati* (°*te*) is abundantly represented. The formal and semantic distinction between *-ayati*, active, and *-āyate*, middle (Wh. 1059c), is probably extinct; since our language commonly substitutes active for medio-passive endings, we find intransitive denominatives in *-āya-* with active endings: *avaśyāyanta ūṣmāyanto bāṣpāyantaḥ* LV 251.8 and 12 (prose), 'turning to hoar-frost, to steam, to vapor'. Sometimes the denom. appears with the MIndic ending *-eti*, which may represent either *-ayati* or *-āyati* (°*te*): *abhyaṅgeti*, *pratibhāgeti*, *śekheti*. And sometimes it is recorded only in extra-present forms which are ambiguous: *nepatthita-* or *nipacchita-*, ppp.

38.37. Some of the following denominatives are more or less obscure in form and origin; but the same is true of some Sanskrit denominatives. For denominatives based on ppp. stems see § 28.19. Examples of forms in *-ayati* are: *ārāgayati* (see Dict.) and *virāgayati, ārogyayati, udānayati, *vijaṭayati, vilomayati, *svastyayati* (to *svasti*); *bharayati* 'fills' is a MIndic creation to the Skt. *bharita*, a denom. ppp. from *bhara*, see Chap. 43, s.v. *bhṛ* (2).

38.38. Examples of *-āyati* (°*te*) forms are: **kāṅkṣāyati* (ppp. °*āyita* = Pali *kaṅkhāyita*, 'doubted'), to *kāṅkṣā*; *kelāyati* (*kela*°?) 'cares for' = Pali id., Pkt. *kelāyai* (etymology uncertain); *dhandhāyati* to BHS *dhandha*, Pali *dandha*; *prajñāyate*, to *prajñā*; *mamāyate*, °*ti* 'cherishes', to *mama*, 'my'; *maitrāyate*, °*ti*, 'shows love', to BHS *maitrā*, Pali *mettā*; *vṛṣṭāyate* 'rains'; *rahāyati* 'is hidden' = Pali id. (Skt. Gr. °*te*), related to *rahas*; *hriyāyati* (*hrīy*°) 'is ashamed', related in some way to *hrī*; and if mss. of Divy 484.8 are right, *prasavāyitā* (see Dict.), 'delivered (of a child)'.

38.39. There are also a few forms in *-īyati*, in which the origin of the *ī*-vowel is sometimes obscure. Besides the onomatopoetic *ciṭiciṭīyati*, § 38.34, I have noted *artīyati* (and various other related forms or alternative spellings, see Chap. 43) 'is grieved', connected with *ārti*; *balīyati* 'grows strong, prevails', to *bala*, very likely influenced in form by the comparative *balīyas*; *sātīyati* or (v.l.) *sādīyati*, also *svādīyati*, 'takes pleasure in', cf. *śāta*, Pali *sāta, sātiya*, adj., 'pleasant', and *sādiyati* 'agrees to', interpreted by Childers and PTSD as connected with root *svad*, while they connect *sāta* with the (BHS and) somewhat dubious Skt. *śāta*, lexical only except for *atiśāta* Gīt. 10.9; *sābhīyati*, apparently 'is slow, delays' (of obscure origin).

38.40. On **adattādāti* (fut. °*dāsyatha*), anomalous if denom. from *adattādāna*, see § 28.53.

Causatives in *āpayati* (*āpeti, āveti*)

38.41. Like MIndic generally, BHS has a freely productive suffix *āpayati* (or the like), which unlike the forms in *ayati* has definitely causative meaning. It has no other function, and the cases where it seems to have lost it, that is to be used in the sense of the simplex, are minimally small in number (§ 38.58). Some of them I consider formal blends of two other forms. It seems certain that its very extensive development in MIndic, where it is the only causative formation that is productive on a large scale, is due to this semantic precision, which gave it a great advantage over its older but ambiguous rival *ayati*. For occurrences in Skt. of these 'bastard stems with *āp* added (as in Prakrit)', as Whitney calls them, see his Roots, p. 238.

38.42. On the origin and use of this suffix see my article in *Language* 22(1946).94–101. Following M. Leumann, IF 57.224 (somewhat similarly, and earlier, Tedesco, JAOS 43.389), I believe that it started from pairs of participles in *-ita*, non-caus., and *-āpita*, caus., from certain old bases containing root-final Skt. *ā* (heavy bases); especially *sthā* and its cpds., also certain cpds. of *dhā, dā*, and *mā* 'measure'. Such roots regularly formed causatives in Skt. *-payati*, which in Skt. is nearly limited to roots in final *ā*. So Skt. had ppp. *utthita* 'arisen', and caus. *utthāpita* 'raised, lifted up'. By analogy with such pairs, other participles in *ita*, of whatever origin, formed (first, apparently) causative participles in *āpita*. Such participles in *ita* were regular with presents in *ayati* (= MIndic *eti*), especially causatives and denominatives. But also, from early times, pples. in *ita* are associated with presents in *ati*, e. g. RV *rakṣita* to *rakṣati*, AV *patita* to *patati*, *likhita* to *likhati*. And *any* ppp. in *ita* could form an analogical causative ppp. in *āpita*. So, on the model of *utthāpita* (etc.) to *utthita*, such forms arose as BHS *pradīpāpita* 'caused to be lighted, ordered lighted', to *pradīpita* 'lighted' (ppp. of *pradīpayati* 'lights', originally caus. of *pradīpyate* 'is alight'), a causative to a causative; or *daṇḍāpita* 'caused to be punished', to *daṇḍita* 'punished' (ppp. of denominative *daṇḍayati* 'punishes'); or *likhāpita* 'caused to be (ordered) written', to *likhita* 'written' (ppp. of *likhati* 'writes'). From such participles in *āpita* it was a short and inevitable step to new causative presents like *pradīpāpayati, daṇḍāpayati, likhāpayati*, and a host of similar MIndic forms, with full inflections.

38.43. Tedesco, l.c., assumed as starting points *deti* : *dita* : *dāpayati*, and *jeti* (Skt. *jayati*) : *jita* : *jāpayati*. But *jāpayati*, tho recorded in VS, itself needs explanation as much as the MIndic forms, of which it is in fact only an early-recorded example. And the pairs of participles clearly furnish a better basis than the presents for the proportional analogy. They were much used, for example, even in Skt., and still more in MIndic (in Pkt. except AMg., exclusively), in the place of preterite verb forms (cf. Renou, Gr. scte. p. 509, § 377); e. g. *utthitaḥ* 'he arose', Mbh. (Calc.) 13.192.

38.44. Note particularly the following case, instructive as proving philologically the importance of the ppp.; Leumann l. c. 224, 226 hardly does justice to it. In Classical Skt. the ppp. *ucchrita* 'elevated', as adj. 'lofty', and the gerund *ucchritya* 'raising, lifting up', are the only common forms of *ud* plus root *śri*. Finite forms are rare. The active *ucchrayati* 'raises' (trans.) does, indeed, occur; the middle *ucchrayate* 'rises, stands upright' is however only Vedic, dead in Classical Skt. (tho quoted grammatically). Even more striking are cpds. of *ud-śri*: according to BR and pw they seem to show no finite forms whatever, only the ppp. *abhyucchrita, procchrita, samucchrita*.

38.45. In Pali also *ussita* 'high, lofty', and *samussita* 'elevated', or (much oftener) figuratively 'haughty, arrogant', are common forms. In normal Pali usage (as to some extent even in Skt.) they are adjectives, not participles. That is, they were hardly associated any longer with the verbs to which they once belonged systematically. These verbs, in fact, have only a shadowy existence in Pali, it would seem. PTSD cites *usseti* only twice, both times with object *yūpa* (Jāt. iv.302.5; vi.203.9), and *samusseti* just once in opt. *samusseyya* (AN i.199.15; PTSD 'to be grandiloquent', not very felicitously), in a situation which clearly proves that it was a back-formation from *samussita* (used in the first line of this passage, AN i.199.1).

38.46. But Pali has a participle *ussāpita*, and a present *ussāpeti*, 'lifts up, raises' (e. g. a banner, a parasol, an elephant's trunk), also 'heaps up, makes a pile of' (sand, wood, bones), which is common; and even a nom. act. *ussāpana* 'raising' (of a banner; cf. *samudānana* to *samudānita*, § 38.3). It seems to me certain that this group was based on *ussita* = Skt. *ucchrita*, not on the rare *usseti* = *ucchrayati*. It is, of course, not certain that in this case the caus. ppp. *ussāpita* was formed before the caus. pres. *ussāpeti* (once started, the analogy could have led directly to the latter); but this present, too, was surely based, directly or thru the ppp. *ussāpita*, on the adj. (ppp.) *ussita*, and meant 'makes high' (*ussita*). The meaning, besides the rarity of *usseti*, makes it much less likely that it was based on *usseti* 'raises'; if it had been, it should have meant rather 'causes to raise' or 'to be raised'.

39.47. BHS has *ucchrāpayati*, a Sanskritized form of *ussāpeti*. Indeed this form is reflected even in the (late) Vedic language: VS 23.26 *ucchrāpaya* 'lift up!' This, like many other Vedic forms, is to be understood as a MIndic borrowing.

38.48. Once this process was established, however, it is obvious that presents in *āpayati* could be made as causatives to any presents in *ayati*; and, since we have seen that these are interchangeable in MIndic with *ati* presents, they could be made as causatives even to these. Hence such forms as BHS *āhvāpayati* 'causes to summon', to Skt. *āhvayati* 'summons' (Pali *avheti*); and sporadically in Skt. or even Vedic (VS. *jāpayati* to *jayati*, and *ucchrāpaya*, above), under MIndic influence.

38.49. As noted just above, BHS and general MIndic causatives in *āpayati* (or equivalent) may be based on presents in either *ayati* (MIndic also *eti*), of any of several different types, or *ati*. In the following lists an attempt will be made to sort the *āpayati* forms according to different categories to which the presumed simplex seems to belong.

38.50. In some cases doubt may exist, or may at first sight seem to exist, as to just what primary verb was the base of the *āpaya*-causative. The doubt is often more apparent than real. So *kṣamāpayati* 'asks pardon' is, I believe, certainly a fundamentally MIndic caus. (tho it

occurs also in Skt.) to *kṣamati* (°*te*) 'endures, is patient'. It is true that there is a Skt. *kṣamayati*, having the same (caus.) meaning as *kṣamāpayati*, and some might ask, why could it not be the base of the latter? The answer is double. First, there is no proof that *kṣamayati* survived in MIndic; no Pali **khameti* or Pkt. **khamei* seems recorded. Second, and more important: as I showed in Language 22.94–101, and as will be more fully shown below, the meaning is against that theory. If based on *kṣamayati*, *kṣamāpayati* should mean 'causes to ask pardon', or the like. We should not expect it to be, as it is, a synonymous substitute for *kṣamayati*. Hence, even when a Skt. *aya*-causative persists in MIndic, as in Pali *nivatteti* = Skt. *nivartayati* 'sends back, makes to (re)turn', the new MIndic caus. Pali *nivattāpeti* 'sends back' is based not on *nivatteti* but on *nivattati* = Skt. *nivartati* (°*te*) 'returns' (intrans.).

38.51. Our lists will include all BHS examples (so far as noted by me) formed in MIndic fashion in *āpayati* (*āpeti, āveti*), even if they are recorded in Skt. (as *kṣamāpayati, ucchrāpayati; jāpayati*, above), since these are clearly of the same type, and I think they are best regarded as MIndicisms in Skt. I shall not, of course, record regular Skt. forms like *dā-payati*; nor such Skt. forms as *ropayati*, to root *ruh*, which are indeed aberrant in Skt., but do not show the same pattern with the MIndic *āpayati* forms (nor any MIndic pattern; they are stray anomalies which concern Skt. alone).

38.52. Forms in apayati from roots in ā. Before listing the *āpayati* forms, however, we must refer briefly to the fact that, as in Pali and Pkt. (Geiger 180, Pischel 551), the root-final *ā* of some roots may be shortened before *-paya-*. This occurs, in fact, in Skt., notably with *jñā*, where *jñapayati* is recorded even in AV, *jñāpayati* only from the Brāhmaṇas according to Whitney, Roots; also *snapayati* (AV +) for *snāp*° (RV +); *glapayati* for (older) *glāp*°; *mlapayati* (late and rare) for *mlāp*°. (Leumann's attempt to explain these short *a* forms, IF 57.227, seems to me unconvincing.) Presumably by analogy with the very common Skt. equivalents *jñapayati*: *jñāpayati* (and perhaps also *snapayati*: *snāpayati*), MIndic has such forms (generally paralleled by forms in *-āp-*) from other roots in *ā* which in Skt. never shorten to *-ap-*. The BHS examples (in addition to *jñapayati* and *snapayati*, inherited from Skt.) are parallel to Pali forms: *sthapemi* (also *thap-*; *ṭhap-*), and cpds. *utthap-*, *upasthap-*, *pratiṣṭhap-*, *viṭhap-*, to *sthā* (Pali *ṭhapeti*, and cpds.); *samādapeti* (Pali id.) to *dā*. The ppp. *nidhyapta* (-*citta*, Śikṣ 130.13; also noun *nidhyapti*), apparently to *dhyā*, corresponds to Pali *nijjhatta*; it is paralleled by Skt. *jñapta* (B +, Whitney, Roots) from *jñā*. On all these see Chap. 43. We proceed to list the BHS forms in causative *āpayati* (or equivalents), and first those based on present stems in *ati*.

38.53. Causatives in āpaya (āpe) to present stems in a.

adhīyāpita (= Pkt. *ahijjāviya*) 'caused to study' Mv iii.394.9 (prose), to *adhīyate* 'studies'.

icchāpita (Pali *icchāpeti*, Childers; AMg. *icchāvei*) 'caused to desire' Divy 256.1, to *icchati*; *pratīcchāpaya* (Pali *paṭicchāpeti*, Pkt. *paḍicchāvei*) Mmk 27.24, to *pratīcchati*.

karāpayet, KP 158.7 (prose), to *karati* (Dict.). Possibly, however, this is a corruption for *kārāp*° (§ 38.57), which occurs shortly after in KP 159.12, and which is the usual form.

kartāpayet (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'shall cause to twist' Mmk 57.7, to **kartati* (Dict.) 'twists'.

ākramāpito (? by em.) Mv iii.363.9, 'caused to be buried', to *ākramati*, 'buries'; see Dict.

krīḍāpayati (Pali *kīḷāpeti*) 'causes to play' Mmk 458.20; °*petha* Mv i.227.12; ii.151.13; 153.8 etc. (all prose); to *krīḍati*. Skt. *krīḍayati* is apparently not recorded in MIndic.

kṣamāpayati (late Skt.; Pali *khamāpeti*, Pkt. *khamāvei*) 'asks pardon; takes leave of, says farewell to'; °*payanti* LV 379.6 (prose); °*penti* Mv iii.359.10 (prose); °*payām āsa* Mmk 640.19 (vs); °*peyaṃ* (1 sg. opt., v.l. °*payeyaṃ*) Mv i.37.8 (prose); °*payitvā* LV 38.14 (prose), etc., to *kṣamati*. No **khameti* (Skt. *kṣamayati*) seems recorded in MIndic.

kṣipāpayet (Pali *khipāpeti*) 'would cause to be thrown', Mmk 528.27 (prose); *kṣipāpayitavya* id. 49.19 (prose); to *kṣipati*.

khanāpayitvā (AMg. *khaṇāvai*, and Pali *khanāpeti*, Childers) 'having had dug' Mv i.352.21 (prose), to *khanati*; *utkhanāpayiṣyaṃ* Mv ii.437.13 (prose); *utkhanāpita* Mv ii.437.16 (prose), iii.363.11 (prose); pass. *utkhanāpiyamāna* Mv ii.439.6. The Skt. caus. is *khānayati*; *khanayām āsuḥ* is recorded in BR once, Rām. 2.80.12, but modern editions read *khān*°. Cf. Aśokan *khānāpeti*, blend of *khānayati* and *khanāpayati*; also *khānāpāpita*, § 38.63.

khādāpaya (Pali *khādāpeti*) 'cause to eat' Mmk 56.26 (prose); *khādāpita* Mv i.24.16; ii.479.10 (both prose); to *khādati*. No **khādeti* (Skt. *khādayati*) seems recorded in MIndic.

gāyāpayataḥ 'cause (dual) to sing' MSV iii.16.6; to *gāyati*.

gṛhṇāpayati (Pali *gaṇhāpeti*) 'causes to take' Mmk 28.9; 29.13; 564.10; *gṛhṇāpetvā* Mv iii.393.19 (prose); to BHS *gṛhṇati*.

grathnāpayataḥ 'cause (dual) to twine, wind' MSV iii.16.5 (prose), after *grathnītaḥ*; to **grathnati*, *grathnāti*.

carāpayeyaṃ, opt. (Pali *carāpeti*) 'I would cause to move, proceed' SP 53.4 (vs); to *carati*.

chindāpayiṣyāmaḥ (Pali *chindāpeti*) 'we shall cause to be cut off' Mv iii.403.9 (prose; so mss., ed. em. °*yāmi*); to BHS and Pali *chindati*.

jalpāpayati (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'causes to speak' Mmk 421.21; to *jalpati*.

pratijāgarāpetha (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'cause to be cared for, looked after, prepared' Mv ii.156.9 (prose), to *pratijāgarati* (Dict.).

jīvāpayati (also late Skt.; Pkt. *jīvāvei*; apparently not in Pali) 'causes to live' Mmk 574.24; 696.20 (both prose); to *jīvati*. Skt. *jīvayati* has no recorded descendant in Pali or Pkt.

anujānāpehi (Pali *anujānāpeti*) 'cause to consent' i. e. 'ask permission of' Mv i.256.14 (prose); *anujānāpetvā* 'having got permission' Mv ii.174.17 (prose); to *anujānāti*.

daśāpayati (Pali *ḍasāpeti*, Childers) 'causes to bite' Mmk 462.13 (prose); to *daśati*. Cf. next.

daṃśāpayet (AMg. *ḍaṃsāvei*) 'shall cause to bite' Mmk 463.6 (prose); to *daṃśati* 'bites' (Chap. 43); cf. preceding. Skt. *daṃśayati* seems not to be preserved in MIndic.

dahāpaye (not in Pali or Pkt.) Mv iii.20.8, *dahāpetvā* 9 (vss) 'cause to burn, have burned'; to *dahati*. Cf. *dāhāpayati* § 38.61.

duḥkhāpayasi (= Pali *dukkhāpeti*) Mv i.179.19 'afflict'; to *duḥkhati* (Dict.), properly denom., but no **duḥkhayati* is recorded.

uddhvasyāpayitvā, to *uddhvasyate* 'is insulted', pass. of *uddhvaṃsati*, § 38.13.

pattīyāpayiṣyāmi (cf. Pkt. *pattiāvei*) 'I shall cause to believe' SP 288.5 (prose); to *pattīyati* (Chap. 43) 'believes'.

pivāpayet 'should make drink', and *pivāpayetu-(kāma)*, Kashgar rec. for text *pāyayeyam*, *pāyayitu-*, SP 322.2 (prose), to *pibati*.

opunāpayitavya (Pali *opunāpeti*) 'to be caused to be winnowed' Mv iii.178.5, to **opunati* = **ava-punāti*, see Dict.

bandhāpetha, impv. (Pali *bandhāpeti*) 'have bound' Mv i.258.9 (prose; mss. °*yetha*); °*petvā* Mv iii.175.6 (prose); °*payitavya* Mmk 529.20 (prose); to *bandhati* (= *badhnāti*).

(*budhyāpayati*, 'causes to become enlightened', to *budhyate*, is implied by the nouns *budhyāpaka*, °*pana*, which may be genuine forms; see Dict.)

paribhuṃjāpetvā (not in Pali; but acc. to Childers *bhuñjāpeti*; cf. AMg. *bhuṃjāvei*) 'having caused to enjoy or eat' Mv iii.148.15 (prose), to *paribhuñjati*.

muñcāpetha (Pali *muñcāpeti*) 'cause to be freed' Mv iii.297.12 (prose); °*payati* Mmk 640.18 (vs); 704.10 (prose); to *muñcati*.

ramāpetha (Pali *ramāpeti*) 'cause to take enjoyment' Mv ii.151.13; 153.9 (both prose) etc.; °*pehi* id. 430.4 (prose; in same line *rāmehi*!); iii.5.16; 6.3 ff. (all vss); *ramāpayate* Mmk 571.20 (prose); *abhiramāpetha* Mv ii.103.8; 144.15 (both prose); °*penti* Mv iii.70.14 (prose); to *ramati*.

abhiruhāpayitvā (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'having caused to mount' Mv iii.39.6 (prose); to *abhiruhati* (cf. next).

rohāpayati (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'causes to grow' KP 30.1 (prose); to *rohati* 'grows' (not to the early Skt. caus. *rohayati* which was superseded by *ropayati*). Cf. prec., and *ropāpayasi* § 38.57.

likhāpayati (Pali *likhāpeti*, etc.; also late Skt.) 'causes to write': °*payed* SP 51.4 (vs); 226.4 (prose); 342.5 (vs); KP 159.19 (prose); °*payitvā* Divy 547.6 (prose); *abhilikhāpayitavya* Mmk 68.9 (prose); to *likhati*.

lavāpayitavya (Pali *lavāpeti*) 'to be caused to be mown' Mv iii.178.4 (prose); to **lavati*, Pkt. *lavai*.

vandāpayiṣyāmo (Pali *vandāpeti*) 'we shall cause to pay homage to' Mv ii.26.6 (prose); *vandāpayetsuḥ* Mv i.223.13 = ii.26.9 (vs); to *vandati*.

upaviśāpita (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'caused to sit down' Mv ii.103.4; 180.15; 446.14, 15; iii.36.7; 406.2, 4 (all prose); °*payitvā* Mv ii.479.10 (prose); to *upaviśati*. — *saṃviśāpehi* (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'cause (allow) to cohabit' Mv ii.430.6 (prose); to *saṃviśati*.

pariviṣāpita (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'caused to be waited on' Mv ii.439.4 (prose); to *pariviṣati*.

nivuṭṭāpiya (ger.; not in Pali or Pkt.) 'holding down, causing to sink down' Mv ii.172.7 (prose); to *nivuṭṭati* (Dict.), of which the ger. *nivuṭṭiya* occurs in preceding line.

nivartāpayituṃ (Pali *nivattāpeti*) 'to cause to return or turn back' Mmk 86.3 (prose); to *nivartate* (also Pali *nivatteti* = *nivartayati*); *pratinivartāpayitu* (read °*paya tu*) Divy 346.10 (prose). (Pali only *paṭinivatteti* = °*vartayati*.)

vardhāpayitvā 'having wished success to' (*jayena*, in addressing a king) Mv i.310.2 (prose); *vaddhāpayitvā* Mv ii.421.11; *vaddhāpita* (mss.; ed. em. *vardh*°) Mv i.287.16 (prose); aor. *vardhāpaye* Mv ii.38.1; to *vardhate* (in such phrases as *diṣṭyā vardhase*, etc.). Cf. *vardhayati*, Dict. Pali has *vaḍḍhāpeti* and Pkt. *vaḍḍhāvemi*, but whether they are used in this same sense I am unable to say.

varṣāpayati (Pali *vassāpeti*) 'causes to rain' Mmk 464.1 (prose); to *varṣati*. (Skt. *varṣayati*; acc. to Childers Pali also *vasseti*, and PTSD cites caus. pple. *vassita*.)

śikṣāpayati (Pali *sikkhāpeti*, Pkt. °*āvei*) 'causes to learn', i. e. 'teaches': °*payasi* LV 125.19 (prose); °*peti* Mv iii.362.5, °*pehi* id. 4, °*payiṣyāmi* id. 1 (all prose); °*pita* Mv iii.394.9; Divy 198.3; 369.27; 391.8 (all prose); Mmk 57.8 (prose); to *śikṣati* (Skt. *śikṣayati*, but no Pali or Pkt. **sikkheti*, except once Pkt. *sikkhayanta*, pr. pple., Sheth).

śiṣyāpayati = prec., but may be caus. to *śiṣyate*, see Dict.: °*payiṣyasi* LV 126.12.

śayāpito (Pali *sayāpeti*) 'caused to lie down', to *śayati*. So I think we must read instead of *śayāyito* Mv iii.39.6; 40.2 (prose); Senart reports no v.l. except *śayito* once in one ms. The graphic error *y* for *p* is commonplace; I cannot find any possible analogy for the form printed by Senart and cannot believe that it was originally intended.

niṣīdāpayitvā (Pali *nisīdāpeti*) 'having caused to sit down' Mv ii.435.13; 446.9; iii.70.5 (all prose); *niṣīdāpetvā* Mv iii.298.18 (prose); to *niṣīdati*.

?*prasavāpitā* (em., mss. °*vāyitā*, see § 38.38), 'caused to bring forth, bear' (a child): Divy 484.8 (see Dict.).

pratinisṛjāpayiṣyanti 'will make renounce' MSV iv.140.7; to °*sṛjati*.

harāpayasi 'you let take' MSV iv.207.2; to *harati*.

38.54. Causatives in āpaya (āpe) to presents in aya (e). The *aya* (*e*) is lost before the causative suffix.

38.55. Causatives from *aya* presents which are neither causative nor denominative. There is, of course, no reason in principle for separating these from the rest, from the point of view of our language or of MIndic generally. The separation is made here solely for the convenience of Sanskritists, who may be interested in the different historic backgrounds of various *aya* (*e*) presents which were provided with *āpaya* (*āpe*) causatives.

ānāpeṣyaṃ (Pali *ānāpeti*) 'I shall have (cause to be) fetched' Mv ii.103.5 (prose); °*payiṣyaṃ* Mv iii.125.17 (prose); °*pita*, pple., Mv ii.76.4; 103.3; iii.38.7 (all prose); to *ānayati* (Pali *āneti*) 'fetches'.

ucchrāpayanti (Pali *ussāpeti*) 'they raise' (banners) Mv ii.112.18 (prose); °*payetsu* (aor.) Mv ii.343.22; to ppp. *ucchrita* (Pali *ussita*), see §§ 38.44–47.

vardhāpayata, 'cause to be cut off', to Skt. Dhātup. *vardhayati*, 'cuts': MSV i.119.14; 120.5.

āhvāpayate (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'has (causes to be) summoned' Divy 323.1 (prose); °*pya* (ger.) Av ii.53.5 (prose); to *āhvayati* (Pali *avhayati*, *avheti*).

38.56. Causatives from denominatives: cf. *duḥkhāpayasi*, *śiṣyāpayati*, § 38.53, to denom. *duḥkhati*, (?)*śiṣyate*; perhaps *baddhāpayitavya*, below, should be entered in that section, since the pres. seems to be *baddhati*.

andhakārāpita-(tva), caus. pple. to Skt. denom. pple. *andhakārita* (to *andhakāra*), 'made darkened', see Dict.

avadvārāpayitvā 'having had (the city gate, *nagaradvāram*) closed' Mv ii.490.1 (prose); to a denom. **avadvārayati* (not found), presumably lit. 'gates off', i. e. 'shuts' (a gate).

ārogyāpaya (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'convey a greeting to, cause to be greeted' Divy 128.25; to *ārogyayati* 'salutes' (Dict.).

kelāpayitvā, or *kelap*°, Mmk 708.28 (printed *kaila*°), to *kelāyati* (?Dict.).

cintāpayiṣyāmaḥ (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'we shall cause to think (on)' SP 271.4 (prose); *anuvicintāpayamānāḥ* 'being caused to ponder' SP 109.2 (prose), v.l. of Kashgar rec.; to (*anu-vi-*)*cintāyati*.

citrāpayitavya (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'to be caused to be painted' Mmk 61.16; 68.13, 22 (all prose), etc.; to *citrayati*, *citrita*.

daṇḍāpayanti (Pkt. pple. *daṇḍāvia*) 'cause to be fined or punished' Śikṣ 63.13 (prose); °*payed* 67.10 (vs); to *daṇḍayati*.

prajñaptāpitaṃ (so one ms.; v.l. *prajñāpāyitaṃ*; Senart em. *prajñāpayitaṃ*), with *āsanaṃ*, 'a seat was caused to be provided' (for himself), Mv iii.93.3 and 4. The form would be ppp. to caus. of a denom. from *prajñapta*, 'provided' (§ 28.19).

baddhāpayitavya 'to be caused to be bound' Mmk 50.16; to *baddha*(*ya*)*ti*(?).

bhakṣāpayet (cf. Pkt. *bhakkhāvaṇa*, noun) 'shall cause to eat, feed' Mmk 82.21 (prose); to *bhakṣayati* (or *bhakṣati*) 'eats'.

mantrāpayati (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'causes to announce (etc.)' Mmk 307.5; 566.24 f. (prose); to *mantrayati*.

muṇḍāpayitvā 'having had shaved' Divy 261.15 = AMg. *muṇḍāvei*; to Skt. *muṇḍayati* (Pali ppp. *muṇḍita*) 'shaves'.

vijaṭāpayed 'shall cause to comb (card, untangle; object, wool)' Prāt 498.1; to Pali *vijaṭeti*, denom. to Skt. *vijaṭa*.

veṣṭāpayitavyāni 'to be caused to be supervised' Mv

iii.178.1; to *veṣṭeti*, denom. to *veṣṭi* = Skt. *viṣṭi*, see Dict.

śabdāpita (*śabdāpayati* allegedly 'summons', but rather 'orders summoned'; evidently MIndic; repeatedly in Rām., but chiefly in the late Book 7, see BR; cf. AMg. *saddāvei*, °*viya*) 'caused to be summoned' Mv i.272.14; ii.100.17 (both prose) etc.; °*piya* (ger.) Mv ii.110.14 (prose); °*payitvā* Mv ii.435.4, 13 (prose); to Pali *saddāyati* 'summons' (Skt. *śabdāyati* 'makes a noise, cries; calls, summons').

sukhāpaye (with mss.) 'I make happy' Mv iii.355.8; *sukhāpita*, °*payitavya*, °*payitu-* (Dict.); to Skt. and Pali *sukhāyate* (°*ti*) 'is happy'.

saṃhārāpayitavya, see next §.

hriyāpayanti (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'make ashamed' Bhīk 11a.5; to *hriyāyati* (Dict.) 'feels shame'.

38.57. Causatives from *aya* forms which are themselves originally causatives, or at least secondary-conjugation or '10th class' forms in *-aya-*, and apparently not denominatives. Note however that these causatives in *āpaya* (*āpe*) are not synonyms of the underlying 'causatives' in *aya*, but have the meaning of causatives in relation to them; they are so-called 'double causatives'. Cf. Lang. 22.97 f.

niṣkāsāpayitum 'to have (cause to be) expelled', caus. to *niṣkāsayati* 'expels', Divy 339.6 (prose).

kārāpayati, °*peti* 'has (causes to be) effected or performed', caus. to Pali *kāreti* 'performs', also Skt. *kārayati*, 'not infrequently in the meaning of the simplex' BR s.v. 1 kar, caus., 7. Pali *kāreti* apparently never has genuine caus. meaning; PTSD, tho entering it under the heading *Caus.*, adds the inconsistent and confusing parenthesis '(Denom. to *kāra*)'. Cf. §§ 38.5, 6; Lang. 22.95, 97. — *kārāp-ayanti* SP 15.3 (vs); *-ayet* KP 159.12 (prose); *-aye* Mmk 86.25 (prose); *-ayi* (aor.) SP 114.11 (vs); Mv i.118.5 (vs); *-ayīṣū* (or better *-ayiṃsū*), § 32.35, SP 50.16; 51.1; *-ayiṣyaṃ* (fut.) Mv i.325.17 (prose); *-ayamāna-* Mv i.96.6 (prose); *-ayi* (ger.) SP 152.5 (vs); *-ayitvā* Mv i.52.13, 63.9; Mmk 49.17 (all prose); *-enti* Mv i.26.15 (prose); *-etha* Mv i.258.11; ii.111.5; 156.7 (all prose); *-ehi* Mv ii.73.18 (prose); *-ita-* SP 50.14 (vs); 110.6 (prose); Mv i.18.2; 19.11; 349.17 (all prose), etc.; Divy 375.3; common. Cf. *karāpeti*, above, § 38.53; also § 38.62.

To the cpd. *alaṃkaroti*, or rather MIndic *alaṃkarati* (e. g. Pali *alaṃkara*, 2 sg. impv., CPD), is found a caus. *alaṃkārāpeti* 'causes to adorn', found also in Pali (°*petha* Mv ii.103.7; 111.4; 153.14; °*pehi* Mv iii.441.20, all prose); no **alaṃkārayati* or °*kāreti* seems recorded anywhere; presumably *alaṃkārāpeti* is analogical to the uncompounded causative *kārāpeti*. The proportion would be *karoti, karati* : *kārāpeti* = *alaṃkaroti*, °*karati* : x.

kalpāpayitvā (Pali *kappāpeti*) 'having caused (hair and beard) to be trimmed', Mv ii.489.8 (prose), caus. to Pali *kappeti* 'trims'. Skt. also uses the pple. *kḷpta* of the simplex *kalpati* in the meaning 'trimmed', of hair.

ghoṣāpita 'caused to be proclaimed' Mv iii.390.19 (prose); *ghoṣāpayitavān* (§ 34.8) 'he ordered proclaimed' SP 257.4 (prose); = Pali *ghosāpeti*, caus. to Pali *ghoseti* 'proclaims'; Skt. both *ghoṣati* and *ghoṣayati* in same mg., 'proclaims'.

otārāpita 'ordered brought down or out' Mv i.273.16 (prose); caus. to *otāreti* (Mv i.272.11 *otārehi* 'bring down!') = Pali id., Skt. *avatārayati* 'brings down', itself caus. to *avatarati* 'comes down'.

pradīpāpita (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'ordered lighted, caused to be lighted' Mv iii.177.8 (prose); to *pradīpayati* (Pali *padīpeti*) 'lights', caus. to *pradīpyate* 'is alight'.

dhārāpayet (aor.) 'caused to hold' (a parasol) Mv ii.117.5 (prose); *dhārāpayehi* (so with mss.) id. ii.447.14 (prose); caus. to Pali *dhāreti* = *dhārayati* 'holds'.

bhīṣāpayet 'shall cause to be frightened' Prāt 518.10 (prose); = Pkt. *bhīsāvei*, caus. to Pkt. *bhīsei* = *bhīṣayati* 'frightens'; Lang. 22.97.

mārāpemi 'I cause to be killed' Mv ii.247.3 (prose); = Pali id., caus. to Pali *māreti* = *mārayati* 'kills'.

yojāpayanti 'they cause to be yoked' Mv iii.101.20 (prose); *yojāpehi* iii.441.20; °*pesi* (aor.) iii.442.2; °*payitvā* i.259.8; iii.443.9 (all prose); = Pali *yojāpeti*, caus. to Pali *yojeti* = *yojayati* 'yokes'; Lang. 22.98.

ārocāpita 'caused to be stated' Mv i.307.13 (prose); = Pali *ārocāpeti*, caus. to Pali *āroceti* = BHS *ārocayati*, °*ceti* 'states'.

ropāpayasi 'you cause to be planted' Mv ii.486.6 (prose); = Pali *ropāpeti*, caus. to Pali *ropeti* = Skt. *ropayati* 'plants'. Cf. *rohāpayati*, § 38.53.

vādāpita 'caused to be played' SP 51.11; 52.1; °*piya* (ger.) id. 52.4 (all vss); = Pali *vādāpeti*, caus. to Pali *vādeti* = *vādayati* 'plays (mus. instruments)'.

vārāpeya 'would cause to distribute' KP 158.3 (corrupt); 159.6–7; caus. to *vārayati* (Dict.).

pariveṣāpayiṣyaṃ (text °*veś*°) 'I shall cause to be waited upon' Mv ii.435.11 (prose); to either *pariveṣati* (rare in Skt. for *pariviṣati*; Pali only *parivisati*, but Pkt. both °*visai* and °*vesai*) or *pariveṣayati* (not in Pali, but Pkt. pr. pple. *parivesayanta*), both meaning 'waits upon'; the rarity of *pariveṣati* suggests that *pariveṣayati* is the more likely source.

prativeṭhāpehi 'have enclosed, surrounded' Mv ii.171.12; *veṭhāpita* id. 15; to *veṭheti* = *veṣṭayati* 'wraps, encloses'; Lang. 22.98.

śodhāpayet 'would cause to clean up' SP 107.6 (prose); *śodhāpita* 'caused to be cleaned' Mv iii.298.8 (prose); = Pali *sodhāpeti*, caus. to Pali *sodheti* = *śodhayati* 'cleans'.

śobhāpayati 'causes to be adorned' (*vasuṃdharām*), Mmk 644.17; = Pkt. *sohāvei* (Sheth *saphā karānā*), caus. to Pali *sobheti* = *śobhayati* 'adorns'.

ghātāpayituṃ 'to cause to be killed' Mv i.132.8 (prose); *ghātāpita* 'caused to be killed' Mv ii.170.15; iii.166.8 (both prose); = Pali *ghātāpeti*, caus. to Pali *ghāteti* = *ghātayati* 'kills'; Lang. 22.98.

saṃhārāpayitavya 'to be caused to be gathered' (*dhānyajātāni, khalahāneṣu*) Mv iii.178.5 (prose). This is not simple. One would at first sight connect it with *saṃharati*. But to this root Pali has no **saṃhāreti* nor **saṃhārāpeti*; only *saṃharāpeti*, which is recorded only with 'hair'[1] as the object; this (or 'hair and nails') is also the only recorded object of Skt. *saṃharayati*; both mean 'remove' (hair, etc.). We are dealing here with a different word. With it I would connect a gerundive *saṃhāraṇijja* cited by Sheth, which he associates with *saṃbhārei* 'gathers'. What we have in *saṃhārāpayitavya* appears to be gdve. of a causative to this, in a Prakritic form (as in the Pkt. gdve.). The caus. is recorded nowhere else; *saṃbhārei* is otherwise known in Pkt., but not in Pali, and (as *sāṃbhārayati*) doubtfully in Skt.: in BR (5.209) only cited from Rām. 1.11.3[2] *saṃbhārayāśu nṛpate saṃbhārān yajñasādhakān*. As this passage suggests, *saṃbhārayati* (= *saṃbhārei, saṃhārei*), if it is the true reading, is probably a denom. to *saṃbhāra*, not a caus. to *saṃbharati* as PW takes it.

---

1. Vin. iv.259, last line, and 260.2 ff.; *bhikkhuniyo saṃbādhe lomaṃ saṃharāpetvā . . . vesiyāhi saddhiṃ naggā . . . nhāyanti*: misinterpreted in PTSD 'make gather' or 'grow', where it obviously means just the opposite, 'remove' (the pubic hair, in the manner of courtesans).

2. So Schlegel and Gorresio; others 1.12.3; NWRām. 1.9.40. The reading is not at all certain; more modern editions generally seem to read *saṃbhārāḥ saṃbhriyantāṃ te* for the first pāda (so also NWRām.).

38.58. Formal causatives in (ā)paya without caus. meaning. Renou, Gr. scte. 469, states that even the Skt. suffix *-paya-* is sometimes 'deprived of causative force', but cites no examples. (See Lang. 22.95, n. 5 for other but unfounded allegations as to such use of Skt. *-paya-*.) In standard Skt. such cases, if they occur, are surely extremely rare. They are very rare in BHS also. Nevertheless I have noted a few forms, inherited from Skt., which seem to me quite clearly non-causative in meaning (perhaps by analogy with the more frequent similar use of original causatives in *aya*; above § 38.23):

parinirvāpayeyaṃ Divy 90.10, 'may I enter complete *nirvāṇa*'. Here *parinirvāpayati* is certainly (unless we emend) used precisely in the sense of *parinirvāyati*. In SP 250.12 read *parinirvāpayitu-kāmo* with mss. (except two °*vātu-*), for text em. °*vāyitu-*,

utthāpayet LV 335.15, 'let him set forth' ≐ *uttiṣṭhet*. Similarly *upasthāpayitum*, 'to wait upon' LV 100.13; *upasthapetvā*, 'waiting on' Mv ii.220.18 (see Dict. s.v. *upasthāpayati* 4).

Several such forms occur from *snāpayati* or *snapayati*, both regularly used in Skt. and BHS as causatives to *snā*, but in BHS also as intransitives, like the simplex: *snāpi* (aor.) LV 271.12 'bathed (himself), took a bath'; *snapayantaṃ* Mv ii.77.18 (prose), 'while bathing' (intrans.), and in the next sentence, ii.77.19, as well as ii.78.1, *snāpayati*, 'bathes' (intrans.); *snāpitum* (inf.; Senart em. *snāyitum*) Mv iii.12.5, 'to bathe' (intrans.).

samādāpayati (a MIndic creation tho its form is regular for Skt.), ordinarily causative, twice means 'assumes, takes on oneself' (= *samādiyati*, the BHS and Pali simplex); see Dict. s.v. (5).

38.59. MIndic forms in *āpayati* are rarely used except as causatives to the simplex on which they are based (even when, as in the long list above § 38.57, that 'simplex' is itself a causative, so that the result is a 'double causative', Geiger 182). I have suggested in Lang. 22.98 ff. that most, possibly all, the real exceptions may be explained as blend formations, as follows.

38.60. We have seen that the old Skt. causatives in *ayati* (and even some new MIndic forms of the same type) are still freely used, with caus. meaning, in MIndic. They are sometimes closely juxtaposed in recorded texts with new MIndic causatives in *āpayati* (*āpeti*, etc.). E. g., Mv ii.430.4 presents in the same line, and obviously as synonyms, *rāmehi* (from Skt. *rāmayati*, caus.) and *ramāpehi* (MIndic caus. based on *ramati*). Such collocations may easily be supposed to have led to blend forms like **rāmāpeti* (this particular blend has not been noted), which would have the aspect of a form in *āpeti* based on *rāmeti* but having the same meaning. The only forms of this type which I have noted in BHS, and most if not all similar forms in Pali and Pkt., can be so understood without difficulty. Cf. M. Leumann, IF 57.223, top, and my article cited above.

38.61. So *chedāpayati*, 'causes to be cut off' (= *chedayati*, id., still used in Pali, Mahāvaṃsa 21.18 and 35.43), occurs in BHS only in Mv iii.403.13 (prose) *chedāpayiṣyati*. Here it paraphrases, in free quotation, the equivalent *chindāpayiṣyāmaḥ* (so read with mss., Senart °*yāmi*), a normal MIndic caus. to MIndic *chindati*, 'cuts'. I believe it is surely a blend of this form with *chedayati*, and the collocation in Mv suggests how such forms must often have originated. (Of course they are not limited to such collocations; cf. Lang. 22.99, note 10.)

So also *dāhāpayati*, 'causes to be burned', Mmk 634.9, is a blend of the regular Skt. caus. *dāhayati* with the regular BHS (MIndic) caus. *dahāpayati*, § 38.53, to *dahati* 'burns'.

And *bhojāpehi* Mv i.305.10, if it means 'feed, cause to eat' (cf. Lang. 22.99 with note 11), is a blend of Skt. *bhojayati* with BHS (MIndic) *bhuñjāpeti*, both having the same meaning.

Analogical in a different way is *alaṃkārāpeti* 'causes to adorn', on which see § 38.57.

śāyāpitaka, on which see Dict., if textually correct, seems to be a *-ka* extension of a ppp. of **śāyāpayati*, 'makes go to sleep', = Skt. *śāyayati*, caus. of *śete*. It occurs in prose, MSV i.117.13, and perhaps should be emended to *śayā*° (§ 38.53). The text later, i.120.6, replaces it by *śāyayitaḥ*, the regular Skt. form.

38.62. And finally, in LV 215.9, 12, 16 (vss) the ppp. *kārāpitaṃ*, formally to *kārāpeti* (see § 38.57), seems to imply non-causative meaning like that which *kārayati*, *kāreti* regularly has in MIndic (and sometimes in Skt.), equivalent to *karoti* (or MIndic *karati*) 'effects, carries out', with synonyms of *rājyam*: *aiśvarya* (*ādhipatyaṃ*, *māreśvaratvaṃ*) *kārāpitaṃ*, 'rulership was carried on'. No other interpretation seems to me possible; the Bodhisattva speaks of himself (in the instr.) as the person by whom, in past lives, rulership was 'exercised, performed'; he can hardly have meant that rulership was (by him) 'caused to be performed' (by someone else). Another MIndic form in *-p-* similarly used may be *allīpitavyam*, § 38.67 below. Compare the rare, but undeniable, cases of Skt. forms in *-paya-* which in BHS are used as non-causative intransitives (§ 38.58), and the commoner cases of Skt. causatives in *-aya-* which in BHS are similarly used (§ 38.23).

38.63. On similar cases in MIndic see my article cited above. Note that many of the alleged cases of equivalence between *āpeti* and *eti* forms are simply misinterpretations; the *āpeti* form is really caus. to the *eti* form. So notably the Aśokan forms (ppp.) *likhāpāpita*, *khānāpāpita*, with double *-āp-*, which have never been properly interpreted. They are genuine causatives to *likhāpita*, *khānāpita*, as I showed Lang. 22.100. (So now J. Bloch, Asoka [1950], 91 n. 4, 172.)

38.64. Miscellaneous and irregular forms in payati. A few sporadic irregularities need to be noted. *pāpayati* 'causes to drink', Divy 398.17 (prose), fits the general pattern of Skt. roots in *ā* (*sthāpayati*, *dāpayati*, etc.), but the normal Skt. caus. from this root is *pāyayati* (Pali also *pāyeti*), and I have found no **pāpeti* or descendant in MIndic. It should however be noted that *pāpayati* is occasionally recorded in Skt.; see BR, who regard such forms as mere corruptions for *pāy*°. If they are right, the same might be assumed for the isolated Divy occurrence.

38.65. *ucchrepayati* 'lifts up, sets up' occurs repeatedly (see Dict.), and even forms a noun *ucchrepana* (so, not °*ṇa*). No such form seems to be recorded in Pali or Pkt. It is used exactly like *ucchrāpayati*, on which see above, §§ 38.44–47, 55, and seems to be a blend of that form with **ucchreti* (Skt. *ucchrayati*) = Pali *usseti*, which has the same meaning.

38.66. Our language has a MIndic present *allīyati* (also *alli*°) 'comes, approaches', which however seems to be used also (Mv ii.190.5 ff.) in a causative sense, 'brings'. It corresponds to Pali *allīyati* (defined CPD 'to stick to, to lean against, to be attached to, to be fond of'; caus. *allīyāpeti* 'to attach to, to apply, sew on'), and Pkt. *allīai* (*alli*°) 'come; enter; join' (*joṛnā*); 'resort to' (*āśraya karnā*); 'embrace; be united'; AMg. *allīai* 'to resort to; to restrain or control the senses' (Ratnach.). It is obviously derived from Skt. *ālīyate* (§ 3.4 a). To it, in our language but nowhere else as far as I know, are formed two causatives. One, *allāpayati*, I have found only in the pple. *allāpita* 'brought, caused to come', or perhaps 'ordered brought, caused to be brought' (either would be possible), Mv iii.362.3 (prose). It seems clearly based on the pattern *ānīyate* (passive) 'is brought': *ānāpita* 'caused to be brought' (§ 38.54) = *allīyate* (°*ti*) 'comes' (substantially = 'is brought'), or also 'brings': *allāpita*. There are other

verbs, such as (*ā*)*dīyate* : (*ā*)*dāpita*, which have intransitives (originally medio-passives) in *īya*(*ti*, °*te*) and causatives in *āpaya*; but the close semantic resemblance, amounting to synonymity, between *ānī-* and *allī-* seems to point to *ānī-* : *ānāp-* as the specific source of *allāp-* from *allī-*.

38.67. The other causative, *allīpayati*, is commoner in our texts. I can only understand it as a blend of *allāpayati*, just mentioned, with the simplex *allīyati*. It is significant and important that this latter is used with 'causative' (transitive) meaning in our language, as we saw (see § 38.24 and Dict.). Thus *allīyati* and *allāpayati* (if this meant 'brings') were or could be synonyms; this made the blend-form *allīpayati* all the easier. The process is a sort of inverse of that which gave rise to blends like *chedāpayati* § 38.61. Forms noted are (all prose): *allīpayati* Mv ii.435.14, 'causes to be brought'; °*peya* iii.127.17 and °*peti* iii.144.12 (in these two, the mss. have *y* for *p*, and the first should probably be read °*yeya* and classed as opt. to *allīyati* as trans.; while for the second, one ms. has *allīyanti*; read *allīyati*, trans., 'brings'?); °*pita*, pple., i.311.2; ii.471.1; 472.11; iii.24.4; 408.4; 421.8; °*piyanti*, passive, iii.68.11; 405.15; °*pīyati*, id., iii.127.4. In Mv ii.107.5 *allīpitāni* seems to mean 'were caused to be brought', as if caus. to *allīyati* in caus. sense, 'bring'. On the other hand, in iii.288.9–10 *allīpitavyaṃ*, despite the *p*, seems to be intransitive, 'to be approached, gone up to'; perhaps read *allīyitavyaṃ*? But cf. § 38.62.

38.68. Prakritic forms in āveti. By the side of forms in *āpayati*, *āpeti*, sporadic instances occur (hardly except in Mv; once in Sādh) of Prakritic *āveti*, with *v* for *p*. There are such forms in Pali (Geiger 38.5; *ubbillāvita* beside °*pita*; *visīveti* = **viśyāpayati*), where they must be loans from other (Prakrit) dialects; I assume the same for BHS, where they are certainly not common. (To be sure, the mss., or some of them, record cases which are not taken into Senart's text.) There is no proof that the underlying Prakrit had *āveti* regularly and that *p* was substituted for *v* in the process of Sanskritization.

38.69. The following are examples of *āveti* forms based on presents in *ati*:

gṛhṇāveti 'causes to be taken' Mv ii.467.3 (prose) = *gṛhṇāpayati* § 38.53, to *gṛhṇati*.

bhuṃjāventi 'they cause to eat' Mv i.12.6 (vs) = (*pari*)-*bhuṃjāpeti* § 38.53, to *bhuñjati*.

lambāvayet (Pali *lambāpeti*) 'he shall hang' (trans.) Sādh 170.20 (prose); *lambāviya* (ger., with mss.) Mv ii.172.14 (prose); to *lambate*, °*ti*.

38.70. The rest are causatives to *aya* presents:

ghātāvita 'caused to be killed' Mv i.19.2 (prose) = *ghātāpita* § 38.57, to *ghātayati*.

niveṣṭāvehi (not in Pali or Pkt.) 'cause to be wrapped' Mv i.273.14 (prose; mss. *niceṣṭh*°; Senart em. *veṣṭ*°, omitting *ni*), to Skt. *niveṣṭayati* 'wraps'.

śabdāvitvā 'having had summoned' Mv ii.421.5; 442.2; 491.9; iii.36.11; 390.15; °*viyāna*, v.l. for °*piyāna* (which Senart reads), ger., Mv ii.173.1; (no v.l.) ii.453.13; iii.287.16; °*vita*, pple., Mv iii.36.2 (in same line occurs *śabdāpehi*); 406.3; = *śabdāp-*, § 38.56, to *śabdāyati*.

39. Intensive

39.1. Our language has *caṅkramati* (= Pali *caṅkamati*; AMg. pple. *caṅkamanta*), by the side of the regular *caṅkramyate* (which is found e. g. LV 377.4, 8; in the first, v.l. *caṅkramate*). Examples: *anucaṅkramāmi* SP 55.1; °*manti* SP 84.8; *caṅkrameta* SP 98.10; *caṅkrami* (opt.) SP 344.1; *caṅkramī* (aor.) LV 368.16; *caṅkramed* LV 369.1 (all vss). Others, see s.vv. (*anu*)*caṅkramati*, Dict., and Chap. 43, s.v. *kram* (5). Vedic language has a future *caṅkramiṣyati*, implied in dat. sg. pple. *caṅkramiṣyate* TS 7.1.19.3, KSA 1.10 (154.17), associated with *caṅkramyamāṇāya* and *caṅkramitāya*. Perhaps the MIndic *cankramati* (*caṅkamati*) is analogical to the future (§ 28.13) or the ppp. *caṅkramita* (§ 28.30).

39.2. Similarly, SP 171.11 *jājvalanti* shows a thematic present active instead of the middle *jājvalyate*, intensive of *jval*. Such forms are, in this case, recorded in the Mbh (BR).

39.3. An intensive to *hrī*, not recorded in Skt. or MIndic, is *jehrīyate* Mvy 1829; *jehrīyamāṇa* SP 108.6; *jehrīyante* Divy 39.7.

40. Desiderative

40.1. Beside regular *sussūsati* (Skt. *śuśrūṣate, °ti*), Pali 'often' (PTSD) writes *sussūyati*, which Geiger 184 note 3 regards as a corruption. But Gv 520.23 (prose), 1st ed., reads *śuśruyantaṃ* (read *'śuśrū°*?), acc. sg. pres. pple., which would be a Sanskritization of the Pali form. Is it somehow assimilated to a *ya*-present? However, Gv 2d ed. *śuśrūṣantaṃ* (by em.?).

40.2. Unreduplicated forms, ppp. (*pari-*)*bhukṣita*, adj. *bhukṣa*, and noun *bhukṣā*, for Skt. *bubhukṣ°*, occur as in Pkt. *bhukkhia, bhukkhā*; see Dict.

41. Syntactic addenda to the verb

Special uses of *as* and *bhū*; periphrastic verbal expressions

41.1. Occasionally forms of *as* and *bhū* are used as quasi-particles; cf. the Skt. usages mentioned by Speyer, Skt. Synt. p. 234. So *āsīt* in SP 135.12 (prose) *pūrvaṃ cāham alpaprajño 'lpapratisaṃvedy andhabhūto 'smy āsīt*, 'formerly I was of little intelligence or experience, blind'; lit. 'I am . . ., it was'; and (*a*)*bhūt* in LV 193.11 *mā bhūc chākyakuloditasya gamane chidyeta vaṃśo hy ayam*, 'may it not happen that, on the departure of the scion of the Śākya race, this family shall be cut off' (the verb introduced by *mā* appears to be *chidyeta*; (*a*)*bhūt* seems virtually a constructionless particle; Tib. seems to render by *graṅ*, 'perhaps').

41.2. The periphrastic verb expressions, involving use of participles with or without forms of *as* and *bhū* as copulas, mentioned in Sen 56-7, are on the whole hardly characteristic of BHS in distinction from Skt. (See Renou, Études de gram. skte., Paris, 1936; on periphrastic use of present pples., especially 22–24.) The few stray examples which follow are very unpretentious. All of them could probably be paralleled from Skt., and most of them no doubt have many other parallels in BHS.

41.3. Present participles, with or without auxiliary, in place of finite verbs: (*tatra dhātryaś ca ceṭīvargāś ca sthāpitā abhūvan, pariśeṣāḥ*) *śākyāḥ śuddhodanapramukhāḥ prakrāmantaḥ* LV 125.16 (prose), 'then the nurses and slave-women were halted; the other Śākyas including Śuddhodana proceeded' (is *abhūvan* felt as carried over to serve as auxiliary with *prakrāmantaḥ*?); *na kadācid vayaṃ vidhāryamānās* Divy 177.4, 'we are never kept out'; *ity evamādicaritāni pūrva caranta duṣkarakṛtāni* RP 27.11 (vs), 'such-like actions I was performing of old, difficult tasks'; *āsi* (= *āsīt*, as 1 sg.) *caranta pure ahu* (= *ahaṃ*) *nityam* RP 27.18 (vs), 'I was always performing of old' (here *āsi* as auxiliary).

41.4. Forms of *bhavati* with past pples. are frequent as periphrastic expressions, equivalent to preterites; Sen 56 mentions only the aorist (which he calls imperfect) *abhūt*. Examples of the present *bhavati*: (*yehi* . . .) *paribhuñjitāni bhavanti*, 'were enjoyed (in life)' Mv i.19.4; (*yāva*. . .) *karma vyantīkṛtaṃ na bhavati* i.20.5, 'until their action has been completed'; many others in this context, e. g. i.20.8; 21.14; 22.5–6, 7, 14; 23.3, 4; also i.233.3 *kathaṃ te bhavati* (note sg. for pl.) *imā utpalāni krītāni*, 'how did you get these *utpalas* bought?'; *yathāhaṃ* . . . *snānaśālāṃ praviṣṭo bhavāmi* Divy 420.19–20, 'when I am (have, shall have) entered into the bathroom'.

41.5. Perfect *babhūva*: *saṃbādham āpanno babhūva* Mv i.131.6, 'came into dire straits'.

41.6. Aorist *abhūt* (common; a few others in Sen); *cittam abhyupagataḥ tadā abhūt* Mv i.64.15, 'then arrived at the thought'; *asmābhir apy anye bodhisattvā avavaditā abhūvan*. . . *na ca* . . . *spṛhācittam utpāditam abhūt* SP 101.4 (prose).

41.7. The future *bhaviṣyanti* is used with the perfect active pple. in *tavant*, in a meaning which I find hard to distinguish from the future, in *bhaviṣyanti khalu devasyātyayāt paścimā janapadāḥ paripṛṣṭavanto* Divy 224.3–4, 'you see, after your majesty's death, later people are going to ask' (hardly 'there are going to be people who ask', since the pple. in *tavant* could scarcely bear this meaning). The same future is also used with a noun-formation in *aka*: *katham etāni praveśakāni bhaviṣyanti* Divy 249.4, 'how will they get to enter (lit. become enterers)?'

41.8. In *abhibhūya bhūto* Mv iii.286.3 (prose), 'has conquered', lit. 'has become having conquered', we seem to have a periphrasis consisting of a gerund with the past pple. *bhūta*, taking the place of an auxiliary.

41.9. Sen 61 cites *upeyivān* SP 257.8 (prose) as the only periphrastic use of the perf. pple. in *vāṃs* noted by him in BHS (cf. Renou, Ét. de gram. skte. 25).

42. Constructions with *mā*

42.1. The use of *mā* in BHS differs both formally and semantically from that of standard Skt. (on which see Speyer, Skt. Synt. §§ 353–4, 405, VSS §§ 193, 237; Renou, Gr. scte. pp. 412, 439, 451, 462, 513, 525). Normally Skt. uses *mā* with the augmentless aor., less often with the imperfect and impv., in prohibitions, also sometimes in negative purpose clauses ('in order that not; lest'). There are stray occurrences, particularly in the epic (see Kulkarni, ABORI. 24.83–97), of its use with other verb forms, such as opt., fut., and pres. indic., but they are abnormal.

42.2. In BHS it is very freely used with the opt. (for which the regular Skt. negative is *na*), with the fut. and pres. indic., and with no finite verb at all. As to meaning, while still common in prohibitions and lest-clauses, it is also much used in expressions of strong negative wish or hope, often translatable by expressions of fear. These most commonly relate to future events, but may also relate to the present or past. This use shades over into expressions of dubiety, uncertainty, or worry (almost invariably about something deprecated or regarded as undesirable; rarely only about something the speaker regards as improbable). Such expressions are sometimes clearly interrogative in tone: 'I hope ... not?' 'it isn't so, is it?' 'isn't there reason to fear that . . .?' 'isn't (regrettably) . . .?' Presumably in actual speech these were distinguished by interrogative intonation, if in no other way. In default of any way of indicating this in the text, it is often difficult or impossible to be sure whether it was present or not.

42.3. All these meanings of *mā* occur freely with the opt., fut. and pres. indic., and with no finite verb at all. The non-Skt. meanings occur rarely with the augmentless aorist, and so far as I have noted never with the imperative; these two forms are nearly or quite restricted to their Skt. uses. Augmented preterites are only rarely used (as also in Skt.).

42.4. The negative *mā* is very often accompanied by a particle, most commonly *haiva* (*ha-eva*); frequently *khalu*, which seems interchangeable with *haiva* (cf. Gv 116.20–25 where both occur in parallel expressions); also *tāvat* and *nāma*. But no particle is necessary; all the forms and meanings listed may occur without any. In prohibitive expressions *sma* is sometimes used (LV 192.22) as in Skt.; other particles rarely occur with *mā* in this sense.

Prohibitions

42.5. No examples of augmentless aorist or imperative are quoted, since these are normal Skt.

Augmented aor.: *mā ānanda tathāgataṃ* (so read, Foucaux, Notes p. 113) *prāmāṇikaṃ akārṣuḥ* LV 89.9–10, 'let them not make (consider) the T. measurable!'.

Opt.: *mā tvaṃ svayaṃ gacche, ceṭiṃ preṣehi* Mv ii.169.17, 'don't go yourself; send a maidservant'.

Fut. with *haiva*: *tvāṃ saṃdiśāmī ... mā haiva tvaṃ bālajanasya agrato bhāṣiṣyase sūtram* ... SP 97.5–6, 'I command you, do not recite this sūtra before fools'.

Fut. with *sma*: *mā sma kadācit saṃgītiṃ vichetsyatha* LV 192.22 (prose), 'do not ever interrupt your singing' (in verse parallel 193.12 *saṃgīti mā chetsyathā*, without particle).

Fut. (in the first also present) without particle: *mā prāṇinaṃ ghātayiṣyatha mādattādāsyatha mā kāmeṣu mithyā cariṣyatha mā mṛṣāṃ vakṣyatha, yāvan mā me vijite adharmam utpadyate* (pres.), *mādharmacāriṇo rocetha* (= *rocayatha*, pres.) LV 15.9–11, 'do not kill, steal, be unchaste, lie, and so on, in short, let no wrong take place in my kingdom; do not tolerate evil-doers'; *ihaiva tvaṃ* . . . *karma kuruṣva mā bhūyo 'nyatra gamiṣyasi* SP 106.8, 'do your work right here; go no more anywhere else'; *pūrvaṃgamo bhava tvaṃ mā bheṣyasi paścimas teṣāṃ* LV 185.14, 'be thou the first of them! be not the last!'; *mā dāsyathā jīvitaṃ* LV 335.13, 'don't grant him life'; *mā eṣu bhokṣyatha bhājaneṣu* LV 383.12, 'don't eat in these dishes'; *mā tumhe camuṃ apahariṣyatha* Mv ii.173.14, 'don't take away the coffin'; similarly *mā ... darśayiṣyasi* 173.18–174.1; *mā śociṣyatha mā utkaṇṭhiṣyatha* 215.1–2; *mā atra allīṣyatha* 253.5, 'don't go here!'; *mā dāsyasi* Divy 12.22, 'don't give'; *ārya tiṣṭha mā pravekṣyasi* 82.3, 'Sir, stop, don't enter!'; *mā ... mahāsamudram avatariṣyasi* Av i.199.8, 'don't embark on the high sea!'

Pres. indic., without particle: *māyuktayogīna vadesi etat* SP 93.11, 'do not say this to those who have not practised discipline'; *mā me bhūyo āgacchasi* Mv i.244.7, 'do not come to see me any more!'; Senart, failing to recognize this common use of the present, interprets the verb as aor., which is possible (§ 32.62) but by no means necessary; *devi mā bhūyo padminīṃ paśyanāya nirdhāvasi* Mv ii.451.1, 'queen, don't go out again to visit the pool'; *mā marmabhedīni vacāṃsi vakṣi* Gv 407.1, 'do not speak . . .'

Gerundive without particle: *mā me kathaṃcid upasaṃkramitavyaṃ anyena* Mv iii.225.12, 'let no one else approach me by any means.'

Strong determination

42.6. The prohibitive *mā* shades off, first, into expressions of strong determination, the subject being third or first person. They are hardly what we should describe as commands, yet there is more than mere wish or hope in them.

Fut. with *khalu*: *mā khalu kumāro 'nabhijñāta evābhiniṣkramiṣyatīti* LV 186.14–15, (the king established strong guards around the Bodhisattva's dwelling) 'thinking, The prince is not going to (I'm determined that he shall not) depart (from worldly life) quite unrecognized!'

Fut. without particle: *mā bodhisattvo 'bhiniṣkramiṣyatīti* LV 192.21–2, (same situation; the king stationed men to watch him night and day,) 'thinking, The Bodhisattva is not going to (I won't let him) depart'.

Fut. 1st person, without particle: *mā vaheṣyaṃ etaṃ mṛgaṃ pāśato* Mv ii.236.13, 'I (a hunter who has trapped a deer, but is moved to pity) mustn't (certainly won't) take this deer from the thong' (i. e. I'll let him go free).

'Lest, in order that not' clauses

42.7. The augmentless aorist, and sporadically other forms, are so used in Skt. (Speyer, Skt. Synt. § 405 Rem. 1).

Aorist (common); a single example, without particle:

mā vo bhūd dīrgharātram arthāya hitāya sukhāya LV 409.7, text. But Tib. (which Foucaux mistranslates) obviously read *anarthāya ahitāya asukhāya*, and the original must have had this (cf. the familiar Pali phrase *anatthāya ahitāya dukkhāya*, or *asukhāya*). '(Do not address the Tathāgata with *āyuṣmant*,) lest it result in harm, disadvantage, and unhappiness for you for a long time.'

Opt. with *haiva*: *mā haiva . . . sattvāḥ . . . kiṇīkṛtasaṃjñā* (so for KN *kilī*°, see Dict.) *bhaveyur na ca tathāgate durlabhasaṃjñām utpādayeyur . . . vīryaṃ nārabheyus . . . na ca . . . utpādayeyuḥ* SP 319.6–9, 'lest creatures . . . should get their fancies calloused, and should not get the idea that the T. is hard to find', etc. (note *na* in neg. of *mā*-clause, 'lest . . . not').

Opt. without particle: *tasmād bhavantaṃ na yācāmi, mā me vidveṣaṇā bhavet* Mv iii.419.8 (vs), 'therefore I do not beg of you, lest I become subject to hatred'.

Fut. with *haiva*: *mā haiva kṣepsyanti śruṇitva dharmam*, 'lest on hearing the dharma they reject it' SP 291.12; *mā haivetaḥ kālaṃ kṛtvā narakeṣūpapatsyasa* (ms. °*tsyata*) *iti* Av i.272.12, 'lest dying from this life you be reborn in (one of) the hells'.

Fut. without particle: *mā lakṣaṇā akuśalā vikalpayiṣyanti dvijasaṃghā* Mv i.224.4 = ii.27.4, (Maheśvara-gods came to cast the child's horoscope) 'lest the throngs of brahmans should erroneously distinguish unfavorable signs' (cf. *vikalpa*, Dict.); *mā tena udakarākṣasena khajjiṣyasi* ii.78.4, 'lest you be eaten by that water-ogre'; *devī tato bhaiṣajyaguḍikāto pibanāye na labhati, mā devī pāpakaṃ putraṃ janayiṣyati* ii.432.4–5, 'the queen didn't get (wasn't allowed) to drink from that medicinal pill, that the queen might not bear an ugly son' (as had been predicted); *mā iha anāhāro mariṣyati* iii.132.1, 'lest he die of hunger here'; *mādharmeṇa rājyaṃ kāraya, mā narakaparāyaṇo bhaviṣyasīti* Divy 59.5, 'don't rule unjustly, lest you become headed for hell'; *maitaṃ kaścid dṛṣṭvā śāsane 'prasādaṃ pravedayiṣyatīti* Divy 190.13, 'lest someone, seeing him (a drunken monk), should say unseemly things about the Doctrine'.

Pres. indic. without particle: (Māra says to the Bodhisattva: Do as I bid you,) *mā veṇuyaṣṭi haritām va chinadmi te 'dya* LV 338.14, 'less I cut you off today like a green bamboo stalk'; *mā paritapyāmi* Mv ii.248.7 (so with v.l. for text °*yāsi*, § 27.8), 'lest I suffer for it'; *mā vāṇijakā sāgare vinasyante* (= *vinaś*°) Mv iii.355.11, (the Bodhisattva in a previous birth resolves to give up his life) 'that the merchants (his companions) may not perish in the sea'.

Strong negative wishes or hopes for the future

42.8. The line is not easy to draw between this and the last two divisions, between negative determination or purpose, and negative wish or hope. The problem here becomes, in fact, hardly more than one of translation; and sometimes different choices seem about equally good.

Opt. without particle: *māsmād vrajet sūrato, mā bhūc chākyakuloditasya gamane chidyeta vaṃśo hy ayaṃ* LV 193.10–11, 'may the Gracious One not depart from here; may this lineage not be cut off on the departure, perchance (*bhūt*, § 41.1), of the scion of the Śākya family'. The second *mā* clause is here assumed to be coördinate with the first; but it might also be a 'lest' clause, subordinate to it.

Fut. with *haiva*: *mā haiva kālaṃ kariṣyati śokaprāptā* LV 234.5, 'Oh, I hope she won't die in her grief!' (said of Gopā by her attendants, after the Bodhisattva's departure).

Fut. with *khalu*: *mā khalv ayaṃ . . . kālaṃ kariṣyaty akṛtārtha eva* LV 252.9–10, 'I do hope he will not die without attaining his goal!' (said by gods on observing the Bodhisattva in a trance).

Fut. with no particle: *nivartanaṃ mā ca bhaviṣyatīti* SP 197.7, 'and in the wish (*iti*, with the thought), may (let) there be no turning back!'; *mā maivaṃrūpā . . . bhikṣavo bhaviṣyanti* LV 88.13, (Buddha has just predicted the future existence of evil monks who will not keep the law; Ānanda exclaims:) 'Oh, I hope that there will never come to be monks of that sort!' (God forbid!).

Pres. indic. with no particle: *mā ca kadācid bhūtaguru nātho antarahāyate* Mv i.175.9 (so, or °*hāyante*, which is unmetr., all six mss.; Senart em. °*hāyatu*!; in a series of stanzas in praise of Buddha, spoken by a god at the dharmacakrapravartana), 'and may the Lord, the Guru of beings, never disappear!'

Fears for the future (also referring to present and past)

42.9. The preceding usage leads almost imperceptibly into another and very large group of cases in which disquietude or fear (already present in some of the preceding) becomes the dominant emotion; the negative wish or hope is strongly colored by dread lest it be disappointed: 'I am afraid that . . .' or 'I hope that . . . not'. In a number of these, it is quite possible that questioning intonation was present (cf. below).

Opt. with *haiva*: *mā haiva mama kālakriyā bhavet, sarvam idam aparibhuktaṃ vinaśyet* SP 102.11, '(I am old and have no son;) I'm afraid I may die and all this (wealth) may be lost before it is enjoyed'; *mā haivetvarapuṇya devamanujā . . . no śaktā siya . . .* LV 271.3–4, (the Bodhisattva resolves to go now to the Bodhi-tree;) 'I fear that (otherwise) . . . gods and men would not be able . . .' (could also be interpreted as a 'lest' clause); *mā haiva* (so v.l., text *heva*) *me cyāvaye āsanāto* Mv ii.319.14, 'I fear he may cause me to fall from my seat'.

Opt. with *haiva tāvat*: *na me putro 'sti, mā haiva tāvad ahaṃ aputro kālaṃ kareya* Mv ii.424.17, 'I have no son; I fear I may die sonless'.

Opt. with *tāvat*: *mā tāvad ahaṃ vadhyo daṇḍyo bhaveyaṃ* SP 104.7, 'I am afraid I may be subject to execution or punishment' (or question? 'isn't there danger that I may . . .'?)

Opt. with *khalu*: *mā khalv ime tapasvinas tādṛśaṃ mahāratnadvīpaṃ na gaccheyur iti* SP 187.10, 'I'm afraid these wretches may not go to such a great jewel-island'; *mā khalv ima ekam eva buddhajñānaṃ śrutvā draveṇaiva pratinivartayeyur naivopasaṃkrameyuḥ* SP 189.1, 'I'm afraid they . . . would turn back and not draw near' (parallel to the preceding).

Opt. with no particle: *mā dāni doṣaṃ pi labheyam atra* SP 113.3, 'I'm afraid I may now get even some disaster here' (or question, 'may I not . . ., isn't there danger that I may . . .'?)

Fut. with *haiva*: (once, *haiva tāvat* Mv ii.144.7) *mā haiva . . . dhakṣyathānayavyasanam āpatsyatha* SP 73.6–7, 'I'm afraid you will be burned, will get into trouble and disaster'; here translation by 'lest . . .' would be possible, but not in the closely parallel 73.13 *mā haivāhaṃ ceme ca . . . anayavyasanam āpatsyāmahe*, 'I fear that both I and they will . . .'; *hā dhik śākyakulasya ṛddhi vipulo mā haiva saṃdhakṣyate* LV 194.6, 'woe is me! I fear that the abundant fortune of the Śākya family may be burnt up!'; *yadi kumārasya śāntehi dhyānehi cittam abhiramati, mā haiva tāvad asitasya ṛṣisya satyaṃ vyākaraṇaṃ bhaviṣyati* Mv ii.144.7, 'if the prince's mind takes pleasure in calm meditations, I fear that the sage Asita's prediction may come true'; so, *rājño bhavati: mā haiva yathā asitena . . . vyākṛto tathā bhaviṣyati* ii.151.11–12; likewise ii.153.7 (read *mā haiva . . .*); *mā haiva* (so read with v.l.) *ahaṃ pi tathā eva haniṣyāmi* ii.170.18, 'I fear I too may be slain in the

same way'; *so rājā . . . trasto saṃjāto, mā haiva me sanagarajanapadaṃ śāpena bhasmīkariṣyati* (mss. *bhasmaṃ°*), ii.213.13–15, 'the king was frightened (thinking): I fear he will reduce my land, including city and country, to ashes by his curse'; *mā haiva* (so read with v.l.) *śramaṇo abhibhaviṣyati* 276.19, (Māra says) 'I fear the monk will conquer me'.

Fut. with *khu* (= *khalu*): *mā khu śramaṇarāju bādhyiṣyate* (em., but all mss. point to a fut.) . . . LV 366.2, 'Oh, I fear the king of monks will be overwhelmed!' (said by gods, on the attack of Māra's host).

42.10. In the following the fear applies to a present situation, instead of to future events, altho in the first example one of the verbs is a future of probability:

Fut. with *haiva*, then infin. plus *kāma* with *haiva* and with *khalu* (all parallel): *mā haivāyaṃ māro bhaviṣyati . . . mā haiva mamāntarāyaṃ kartukāmaḥ sarvajñatāyāṃ, mā khalu māṃ viṣameṇa pathā praṇetukāmaḥ, mā khalu me dharmamukhāntarāyaṃ kartukāmo* . . . Gv 116.20–25, 'I am afraid that this is Māra', etc. (or perhaps question, 'isn't this perchance Māra? and doesn't he want' etc.).

In the rest either the pres. indic. is used, or there is no finite verb form; in both cases with or without *khalu* or *haiva*: *kim idam ṛṣe rodasi . . . mā khalu kumārasya kācid vipratipattiḥ* LV 104.3–5, (the king speaks to Asita) 'Why are you weeping, O sage? . . . I hope there is nothing going wrong with (no disaster predictable for) the child'; in verse parallel to this, *kiṃ brāhmaṇo roditī, mā vighnaṃ khalu paśyate 'yam asitaḥ sarvārthasiddhasya me* LV 111.3–4, '. . . I hope this Asita doesn't see any danger . . .'; same situation in Mv ii.32.13 *kiṃ bhagavan taṃ kumāraṃ dṛṣṭvā rodasi, mā kumārasya kāṃcid vipattiṃ paśyasi*, '. . . I hope you don't see . . .'; *asaṅgasya mā khalu viṣaye sajjate manaḥ, mā khalu amarair asaṃcodito vismarati pūrvapratijñām* LV 209.5–7, (gods, seeing the Bodhisattva intently gazing on the women of the harem, say:) 'I hope that, unattached (as he is), his mind is not attaching itself to the world of sense-objects; I hope that, unprompted by the gods, he is not forgetting his former undertaking'; *mā me bhikṣu imehi adhiṣṭhānehi* (so mss.; loc. in sense) *dūṣayatīti* Mv i.244.14, (he became afraid,) 'thinking, I'm afraid the monk is ruining me in these quarters!' (the speaker then proceeds to murder the monk); *kim idaṃ . . . śokārdito upaviṣṭo 'si? mā kiṃcit śarīrasya pratipīḍāṃ paśyasi, mā dhanakṣayaṃ upalakṣasi, mā paracakrabhayaṃ upasthitam* Mv ii.145.12–14, (Śuddhodana to the Bodhisattva:) 'Why are you sitting thus in sorrow? I hope you don't see any bodily affliction, or notice any loss of money, or danger from a hostile power drawn nigh' (but this *mā* clause may be a question, 'you don't, do you?'. . .).

Interesting and somewhat exceptional is *rājā kuśo durāsado duṣprasaho, mā imaṃ muhūrtaṃ anayavyasanam āpadyasi* Mv ii.493.1–2, (the doorkeepers speak to King Kuśa, whom they do not recognize, as he tries to enter his own palace:) 'King Kuśa is hard to get at, dangerous; you're in danger of getting into trouble and disaster this moment!' One might render 'I'm afraid you are . . .', but the speakers do not really participate in the emotion of fear.

42.11. There are also cases referring to past events; the rendering may be 'I only hope . . . not (but am afraid . . .)'. The verb, or substitute for it, is always preterite in effect; but the opt., or future of probability, of the roots *as* or *bhū* may be used with past participles as a sort of periphrastic conjectural preterite (or equivalent of 'future perfect').

Ppp. with *haiva* (and with or without auxiliary): *mā haiva śyāmakaśiri siṃhena vyāghreṇa vā . . . viheṭhito bhūd iti* Mv ii.215.15 (prose), 'I only hope Ś. has not been harmed by a lion or tiger . . .! (but am afraid he has)'; in the corresponding verse account, *aho kaṣṭaṃ, mā haiva ṛṣikumāro viheṭhito!* 225.16–17 (without *bhūt*); *mā khalu anenaiṣāṃ vastrāṇām arthe kumāro jīvitād vyaparopitaḥ syāt* LV 228.15, 'I'm very much afraid the prince has (or, I hope he hasn't) been deprived of life by this person, for the sake of these (the prince's) garments (which the person is wearing)'; repeated substantially 228.20–21; *ṛṣisya etad abhūṣi: mā haiva me mātulakā kenacid viheṭhitā bhaviṣyanti* Mv iii.431.7–8 (fut. of probability), 'the ṛṣi thought: I fear my uncles must have been harmed by some one'.

With no verb form, not even a participle: *deva mā mayā durnṛtyam* Divy 553.17–18; a king sees a fatal omen as he is accompanying his queen's dancing on a *vīṇā*; he drops the *vīṇā*; she says: 'Sire, I hope I haven't danced badly!' (or perhaps a question, 'I haven't danced badly, have I?')

Questions

42.12. In quite a few of the preceding, interrogative intonation may have been present, as I have suggested in several instances. There is no doubt that some *mā* clauses were questions. In other words, the concern, perturbation, or deprecation of a feared condition, which we have found so common, is certainly at times cast in interrogative form. In actual speech this was no doubt made objectively clear by the intonation. Since the writing cannot show this, we frequently cannot be sure whether to assume it or not.

In the following the verb *pṛcchati* proves it: *rājā taṃ sārthavāhaṃ pṛcchati: dharmabhrāte, mā śrānto 'si klānto vāsi? viśrama* . . . Mv iii.350.17–18, 'the king *asked* the (visiting) merchant: Brother in religion, aren't you tired or weary? Rest . . .' In view of this, we may probably assume a question in the same situation where no verb of asking is used: *svāgataṃ śroṇa māsi tṛṣito bubhukṣito vā* Divy 9.16–17, 'welcome, Śroṇa! aren't you thirsty or hungry?'; so also Divy 11.4; 335.8; similarly *svāgataṃ . . . mā kilāmyasi carantu cārikām* Gv 480.4, 'welcome! . . . aren't you tired with going on your pilgrimage?'; *māsi klānto* LV 352.20, (Bodhisattvas to the Buddha just after his enlightenment) 'aren't you tired?' (there follows immediately reference to his strenuous fight with Māra's host).

Another case of a clear question is *māsi dāsī* Bhīk 16a.4, 'you are not a slave-woman, are you?' (in the formal ritual of questioning the candidate for initiation to the order; she must reply *na hi*, 'no!'; there follows *mā āhṛtikā*, and a long list of such terms, *asi* being omitted; all require negative answers; in default of them, the candidate could not be initiated, hence the deprecating *mā*). Doubtless a question is also meant in *mayā snuṣābhihitā: vadhuke mā tvaṃ praṇītāni prahenakāni bhakṣayitvāsmākaṃ lūhāny upanāmayasi*, Divy 14.2–3, 'I said to my daughter-in-law: Daughter-in-law, aren't you eating the fine presents-of-food and giving me poor ones?' and similarly 14.12.

42.13. Two or three times *mā*, with or without *haiva* (the verb, if any, being pres. indic.), is used in negative phrases precisely parallel to positive phrases containing *kaccid*. In Skt., and in BHS, *kaccid* marks a question to which the speaker *hopes* for an affirmative response (BR and Speyer Skt. Synt. §§ 412, 413 are not happy in using the Latin terms *nonne* and *num*, which are not relevant; a better statement in Renou, Gr. scte. p. 511). Its negative in Skt. is *kaccin na*; see e. g. Mbh. (Crit. ed.) 2.5.7 ff., a long series of such questions, some positive, some negative. So also in BHS, e. g. *kaccin na paritapyase* Divy 559.7. But in BHS a question 'I hope . . . not?', in other words the negative of a *kaccid* clause, may be expressed rather by *mā* (sometimes with *haiva*; but not with *kaccid*!): *kaccid bhagavan sattvāḥ svākārāḥ . . . mā haiva bhagavataḥ*

khedam utpādayanti SP 301.1–2, 'I hope, Lord, your creatures are . . .? and that they do not cause you trouble?'; so in the verse version, *mā haiva khedaṃ janayanti* (pronounced *janenti*) 301.7; in SP 429.5 (and similarly 6, 7) *mātīva rāgacaritāḥ* (sc. *te sattvāḥ*), as the preceding, also associated with positive *kaccid* phrases; *mā kiṃcit parihīyate* MSV ii.67.21, 'I hope nothing is lacking?'

42.14. In all the preceding the verb, if any, was pres. indic.; in most of them no particle was used, tho *haiva* was sometimes found. The opt. with *haiva* (or *nāma*) is also used in what seem clearly interrogative expressions; it implies more dubiety or conjecture. The condition inquired about is regularly regarded as something to be feared or deprecated: *mā haiva paribhrameyuḥ* SP 73.4, 'isn't there danger that they would wander around (go astray)?'; *tat kiṃ manyase śāriputra, mā haiva tasya puruṣasya mṛṣāvādaḥ syāt* SP 76.5, 'so what think you, Śāriputra? Isn't there danger (or, likelihood) that that man would be guilty of lying?' (the answer is 'no!'); *mā nāma dahyeyur* SP 87.4, 'isn't it likely (to be feared) that they would be burned?'; *tat kiṃ manyadhve kulaputrā mā haiva tasya . . . kaścin mṛṣāvādena saṃcodayet* SP 322.13 (cf. 76.5 above), 'so what think you, gentlemen? isn't there danger that some one would accuse him of lying?'

42.15. Finally, in some questions astonishment, verging on incredulity, seems to be the dominant emotion, rather than deprecation or fear, tho these may also be present, as in the first:

Pres. indic. with *tāvat*: *rājāha, mā tāvan mamāpicchasi ghātayitum* Divy 380.11, 'you don't mean to say you want to kill *me* too!?' (clearly a startled question; he has just received a hint of this astonishing and terrifying fact).

Mere incredulous amazement, without fear or deprecation, seems implied by the opt. with *haiva* in LV 130.7–8: *ko nv ayaṃ niṣaṇṇo? mā haiva vaiśravaṇo dhanādhipatir bhavet? āho svit . . .* (The ṛṣis, seeing the young Bodhisattva in meditation, reflect:) 'who is this that is seated here? Surely it can't be Vaiśravaṇa? Or else (*āho svit*, marking an alternative *question!*) . . .' (there follows a series of other supernatural beings; finally in line 11 *bhaviṣyati*, fut. of probability, 'will it be . . .?', without negative).

With the particle *tāvat*, and a past pple. or pres. indic., astonishment (in this case somewhat ironical) is also dominant in *mā tāvat tavaikajanmikasya maraṇabhayāt tava rājaśriyaṃ prāpya harṣo notpannaḥ* Divy 422.7, 'you don't mean to say that thru fear of death for you in *one* single life you, having obtained royal majesty, felt no joy?'; *mā tāvad . . . tava na jāyate* (similarly) 422.18.

With *khalu* and no verb (in an equational sentence), astonishment (tinged with annoyance) seems to be suggested by *mā* in LV 330.7–8 *mā khalu mūḍhaḥ ajño 'tha yuṣmākaṃ rūpākṛtiṃ na paśyati*, (Māra speaks to his daughters:) 'Isn't he (the Bodhisattva) mad, or a fool? or doesn't he see your beautiful forms?'

na for *mā* with imperative(?)

42.16. Instead of *mā*, the regular negative with the imperative, *na* is used at least once, if Senart's em. is right, in *na tuvaṃ manasīkara* (but mss. *manasī tathā*) Mv iii.4.2, 'do not concern yourself with it!' I doubt the em.

43. Synopsis of verb forms

This synopsis is meant to include typical examples of (1) forms of verbs which are not known to exist in standard Sanskrit, and (2) non-Sanskritic forms of verbs which do exist there. The first class will be found entered in the Dictionary, the second in the appropriate sections of the Grammar, to which references are often given when it might be troublesome to find them. For the verb, this list, with the detailed table of contents at the beginning, will, it is hoped, be a satisfactory substitute for an Index (which has not been provided for reasons set forth in the Preface).

accha-ti, sit: Pali id., Pkt. acchai
Pres. acchati Mv ii.379.5; Śikṣ 298.4; impv. acchā LV 343.2

añja-ti, anoint: Pali id.; § 28.4
Ppp. añjita- Mv ii.234.17 (= Pali id.)

aṇva-ti, go: acc. to Senart, Mv i.381, from Vedic ṛṇvati
Pres. aṇvati Mv ii.457.15; aṇvāmas SP 168.9 (with Kashgar rec.); pple. aṇvanto Mv ii.212.16; aṇvamāna- Mv ii.441.6
Aor. aṇvi SP 258.10 (so read, Dict.)
Ppp. aṇvita- Mv iii.144.15
Ger. aṇviya Mv iii.145.1
Inf. aṇvitu-kāma- Mv ii.211.10
Gdve. aṇvitavya- Mv iii.178.7

attīya-ti, -te, see *artī°*

ad-, eat (Skt.)
Inf. attave Mv iii.295.12; 299.13 (= Ved. id.); § 36.14

**adattādā-ti*(?), steal, denom.
Fut. adattādāsyatha LV 15.9 (§ 28.53)

adhīya-te, adhī-te, see *i-* with *adhi*

**andhakārayati*, Skt. ppp. °kārita, denom. pple.
Caus. pple. andhakārāpita-, see § 38.56 and Dict.

abhidakṣiṇa-ti, or °*ṇīya-ti*, pass around to the right, denom.
Aor. abhidakṣiṇetsuḥ or °ṇīyetsuḥ (mss.) Mv ii.416.11

abhyaṅge-ti, anoint, denom. to abhyaṅga, unction: AMg. abbhaṅgei, °gai
Pres. abhyaṅgeti Mv iii.154.14; 156.7 (here v.l. abhyaṅgi, which could stand as ger.)
Ger. abhyaṅgitvā, v.l. °getvā Mv iii.23.16 (so with mss.)

?*abhra-ti*, or MIndic *abbha-ti*, go: sautra root in Skt. and Pali
Ger. abhritvā or abbhitvā, perhaps intended by mss. Mv i.187.7 (Dict.)

arcaya-ti, honor (Skt.)
Aor. arcayetsuḥ Mv i.211.18 f.

artīya-ti, -te, be grieved; also ar(t)ti°, atti°, attī, once ārtī° (? v.l. atti°; no other occurrence has unambiguously *ā*-); āstīryati (false hyper-Skt.); see also ardīyati (s.v. *ardaya-ti*) and *ṛtīyate*: Pali aṭṭīyati (and other spellings, see CPD). Denom. from ārti-, with MIndic shortening to arti- (this is not normal in Skt., see BR)
Pres. ārtīyate (read prob. with v.l. atti°) MadhK 297.2; arttīyati Mv ii.242.13 (mss.); arttīyante Mv i.219.17 = ar(t)tīyanti ii.21.19; hyper-Skt. āstīryati, only in Karmav, 47.26; 49.2 et alibi; nārtīyanti Mv i.89.18; nārtīyate Mvy 1830; opt. -mokṣeṇārītīyeran Bbh 282.8 (read, or understand—with MIndic epenthesis?—°ārtī°), repeated in 23 as -mokṣeṇa ritīyeran (read as before, or ṛtī°, see ṛtīyate); pple. attīyantā (or °to, mss.) Mv i.343.1; arttīyanto Mv ii.161.7, 12 f.; -cintayārtīyantaṃ SP 108.6
Ppp. śokārtita- Mv ii.480.7; jarārtita- LV 174.14

arthaya-ti, seek (denom., Skt.)
Pres. opt. prārthaye (2 sg.) Mv ii.483.15; pple. fem. prārthayantī, in pass. mg. (§ 37.18), Mv ii.69.7
Ger. prārthayi SP 213.10
Pass. abhyarthīyase Divy 249.30

ardaya-ti, distress (Skt.)
Pass. pple. ardīyamāna- Divy 39.7 (=Pali addiyati; cf. *artīyati*)

allīya-ti, come to, approach: Pali allīyati (not in this sense), AMg. and other Pkt. allīai, alli° (in this sense); doubtless to Skt. ā-līyate; see §§ 3.4a; 38.66, 67
Pres. allīyati Mv ii.210.19; (caus. sense) allīyanti Mv ii.190.5 ff. (or em. to allīpenti?); opt. allīyeya (caus. sense, Senart em. allīpeya) Mv iii.127.17
Fut. allīṣyatha Mv ii.253.5, 7 (in 7 v.l. alliyiṣyatha); § 31.4
Ppp. allīna- Mv ii.32.1 (also in mg. attached to, in love with, cf. Pali above, Mv ii.100.1); cf. Skt. līna
Caus. (a) Ppp. allāpita- Mv iii.362.3 (§ 38.66)
(b) allīpayati (§ 38.67) Mv ii.435.14; (°peti iii.144.12, read prob. °yati, in caus. sense, see Dict.;) Ppp. °pita i.311.2; Gdve. °pitavya- iii.288.9–10; Pass. allīpīyati iii.127.4; °piyanti iii.68.11; 405.15

1 *aś-*, eat: (1) *aśno-ti*; § 28.58; not in Whitney's Roots, but occurs Bṛh. Ār. Up. (Mādhy.) 3.8.8 (K. aśnāti), and aśnute Boehtl. Sprüche 3067; it probably was substituted for aśnāti by influence of the homonym aś, obtain
Pres. impv. aśnutha Mv i.196.14 (prose)
(2) *aśa-te* (*asa-te*): cf. Pali asamāna; formed on non-presents like aśiṣyati, aśita, aśitvā (Pali asissati, asita, asitvā), perhaps specifically on the future, § 28.14
Pres. ase (for aśe, 1 sg. mid.) Mv ii.56.10 (read with mss. no ase)

2 *aś-*, obtain (Skt.)
Ppp. aṣṭa- LV 390.9 (Ved. in cpds.); § 34.11

as-, be (Skt.)
Pres. si (after cons.) Mv iii.164.15; 207.8; smi Gv 231.5; § 28.64, and cf. § 4.7; asmo (1 pl.) SP 147.9; LV 115.15 (but both doubtful; § 28.60); opt. siyā Mv ii.353.15; siya LV 271.4; siyāti Mv i.45.1; syā Mv iii.314.6, 17; stiya(?) Śikṣ 115.2, 3; asyāt Mv i.286.13; asyā Mv i.42.10; asya Mv ii.228.9; see § 29.41; pple. samāna- (= Pali id.) SP 72.15; Mv i.311.19 (§ 34.3; Dict. s.v.)
Pret. āsi, āsī (1, 2, 3 sg., 3 pl.) SP 62.13 etc. (§ 32.20); āsīsu (v.l. °tsu) Mv ii.305.18 (§ 32.37)

-asa-ti, throw (Skt.); also *ny-asayati*(?). Cf. Ap. nirasahī (3 pl.), Sanatk. (ed. Jacobi) 495.2
Pres. opt. nyaseya LV 151.8
Aor. nyasī (3 pl.) LV 236.14; nyaṣīt (§§ 2.60; 32.45) LV 271.19; nyasayiṃsu LV 222.3 (perhaps read nyasyiṃsu, to ny-asyati, § 32.38)
Ppp. niraṣṭa-, doubtful reading for nirasta-, Dict.

ah-: *āha*, say (Skt.)
(Preterite) 3 pl. āhansu(ḥ), āhaṃsu(ḥ), āhatsu(ḥ), and with ah- for āh-, common in Mv (i.8.1; 18.7, etc., § 33.9)

āṇape-ti, *āṇāpe-ti* (and *āṇapa-ti*?), command: MIndic forms of ā-jñā (§ 2.15); Pali āṇāpeti, Pkt. āṇāvei and āṇavei, āṇavai; here both are found, but only in Mv; āṇa- seems commoner, but Senart usually em. to āṇā-; the mss. are very confused
Pres. āṇapeti Mv iii.125.21; 264.2; °pesi ii.490.8, 16; āṇapati, so probably read ii.25.15; impv. āṇapehi i.362.2, 5 (so read); ii.108.15; āṇāpehi iii.125.19
Aor. āṇapesi Mv iii.299.9; probably read āṇapasi i.223.4
Ppp. āṇatta- Mv i.258.7
Pass. (a) read āṇapyati Mv i.364.20; 365.4, 5
(b) read āṇapiyanti Mv i.362.17; impv. āṇāpiyatu (or °pīy°) i.310.14

āp-, get, attain: (1) *-āpuna-ti*, also *-āpune-ti*: Pali *-āpunati*; to MIndic 3 pl. -āpunanti (9th class), replacing Skt. āpnoti, āpnuvanti; §§ 3.114; 28.17
Pres. prāpuṇeti Mv iii.418.11 (?taken by Senart as caus., but mss. corrupt and text dubious); opt. anuprāpuneyāma (with Kashgar rec.) SP 163.2; paryāpuṇeyā Śikṣ 189.5; impv. prāpuṇehi (mss.) Mv iii.270.14
Fut. paryāpuniṣyanti Mv iii.52.18
Aor. prāpuṇe Mv ii.302.21 (3 pl.); °ṇetsuḥ (mss.; 3 sg.!) Mv iii.338.20; anuprāpuṇi Mv iii.67.2,4; prāpuṇi (3 pl.) Sukh 52.16; paryāpuniṣu SP 181.9 (prose; Kashgar rec.)
Ger. prāpuṇitvā Sukh 24.12; paryāpunitvā KP 130.4
Inf. paryāpunituṃ KP 139.9; anuprāpunitum (so, or °puṇ°, read for °puritum) LV 46.5
Gdve. anuprāpuṇitavya- Mv iii.287.17
(2) *-āpaya-ti*, caus. (Skt.)
Pres. in non-caus. meaning, prāpayanti, they get, Mv i.30.15; 31.15 (§ 38.23)
Fut. in non-caus. mg., prāpiṣya (1 sg.) Dbh.g. 12(348).11 (§ 38.31)
Aor. prāpaye (v.l. °yet) Mv ii.37.15; anuprāvetsuḥ (for °petsuḥ, § 2.30) Mv iii.52.8

ārāgaya-ti, win, acquire, propitiate (see Dict.)
Pres. °yati Mvy 2394; 7602; Divy 173.4; ārāgeti Mv ii.363.4; opt. ārāgaye Mv ii.120.1
Fut. ārāgayiṣyati LV 434.6, 7
Aor. ārāgayī SP 27.12; 384.6
Ppp. ārāgita- SP 393.5
Ger. ārāgayitvā SP 385.6, ārāgetvā Mv iii.415.4
Inf. ārāgayitu-kāma- Śikṣ 244.3

ārūḍhaya-ti, make mounted, cause to mount (denom. to ārūḍha)
Ger. °yitvā Mv iii.146.14

ārogyaya-ti, (a) salute; (b) send greetings to (*grüssen lassen*, caus. to a): denom. to ārogya
Pres. °yayati Divy 129.5; 273.25; impv. °yaya Divy 273.19 (all these b)
Ger. ārogyayitvā Divy 259.11 (a)
Caus. (= b, above): impv. ārogyāpaya Divy 128.25

ārtīya-ti, see *artīyati*

āsa-te, *-ti*, sit (Skt.); also *-āsaya-ti*, *-te*, non-caus.
Pres. adhyāsayati LV 18.8; samupāsayante Dbh.g. 41(67).9; opt. āse Mv iii.422.16
Inf. paryupāsanāya SP 425.3
Pass. āsīyati Mv iii.86.3

āstīryati, hyper-Skt., see *artīyati*

āha, see *ah-*

i-, go: (1) *e-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. upeti Mv iii.110.1, 6; enti (3 pl., § 28.60, as in Pali and Pkt.) LV 74.11; opt. sameyā (§ 29.42) Mv ii.404.8; upeya (ib.) Mv iii.369.21; impv. entu Mv iii.206.15; samabhyupaintu Divy 399.9
Fut. etsye (? § 31.25) Mv i.257.18 and (em.) 11
(2) **ya-ti*: based on 3 pl. yanti. Implied by:
Pres. opt. 3 sg. yeya (or, with mss., yeyaṃ) Mv ii.233.3 (prose; §§ 28.7, 29.31)

i- with *adhi*: (1) *adhīya-te* (rare in Skt.) and *adhīte* (regular), study (Skt.): Pali adhīyati, Pkt. ahijjai
Fut. adhīṣyati Mv ii.77.14 (§ 31.7)
Inf. adhīyitum Mv ii.77.13 (§ 36.2); [adhītum, see ib.]
Caus. pple. adhīyāpita- Mv iii.394.9
(2) Caus. *adhyāpaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. adhyāpehi Mv ii.77.16

iñja-te, *-ti*, move (once recorded *iñca-ti*): Pali id. (Cf. Geiger 41.1)
Pres. iñjate LV 259.7, 20; opt. iñjeya Mv ii.408.5; pple. an-iñjamāna- SP 5.10; iñcati Mahāsamāj. Waldschmidt Kl. Skt. Texte 4.195.4 (Pali correspondent iñjayuṃ)
Ppp. iñjita-(tva-) Mv ii.411.8 (to caus.?)
Inf. iñjitum Mv ii.340.13, 17; 341.11 (transitive; to caus.?)
Caus. inf. iñjayitum Divy 185.10

irya-ti, see *īr-*

1 *iṣ-*, seek: (1) *iccha-ti* (Skt.), also *icchayati*, *iccheti* (non-caus.)
Pres. icchesi Mv ii.483.8; opt. icche Mv ii.427.7; iccheyā SP 278.8; pple. pratīcchayantī Mmk 65.12
Fut. pratīcchiṣyati Mv ii.435.12
Ppp. icchita- Mv iii.24.19; pratīcchita- Gv 349.7; praticchita- Mv ii.165.19
Inf. pratīcchitum Mv i.310.4
Gdve. icchitavya- Mv i.280.7
Caus. impv. pratīcchāpaya Mmk 27.24; Ppp. icchāpita- Divy 256.1
(2) *eṣa-ti* (Skt., at least Epic, in certain cpds. as anv-eṣ°)
Pres. eṣati LV 364.9; impv. eṣatha (text °ta) LV 379.11; pple. eṣan LV 242.10; eṣamāṇa- RP 5.14; eṣāṇa- (§ 34.4) Mv iii.2.9; Divy 559.5
Fut. adhyeṣiṣyaṃ (1 sg.) Mv ii.108.5

Aor. adhyeṣi (3 pl.) LV 416.3; adhyeṣiṣu LV 414.10 (ed. °tu)
Ppp. paryeṣṭa- SP 101.8 (?); adhyeṣṭa- LV 48.11; 412.7; § 34.13
Ger. anveṣiya Mv ii.179.2
Pass. adhyeṣanti Mv i.106.12 (§ 37.32); adhyeṣyante LV 397.5

(3) *-eṣaya-ti*, with adhy-, pary-, in same meaning as *eṣati*
Pres. adhyeṣayāmi Laṅk 7.13, 15; °yasi Divy 329.3, 7; opt. °yeyaṃ LV 415.22; °yet Mmk 38.14; °yeyuḥ Suv 123.9; Śikṣ 354.5
Fut. paryeṣayiṣyāmi Mv i.232.3
Ger. paryeṣayitvā SP 105.13

(4) *iṣya-ti*, *-te* (Skt. in cpds., as anviṣyati)
Pres. iṣye (1 sg.) Divy 476.16 (prose); iṣyasi Divy 560.8 (vs)

(5) *-eṣyati*, with adhy-, pary-, in same meaning as *-eṣa(ya)ti*. Not recorded elsewhere; blend of *-eṣati* and *-iṣyati*? or phonetic corruption?
Pres. paryeṣyāmaḥ Mv iii.59.15 (v.l. °ṣāmaḥ); °ṣyanti Suv 227.2 (textually doubtful); opt. adhyeṣyeyaṃ LV 394.2; °yemahi LV 394.7

2 *iṣ-*, send: *preṣaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. preṣayi SP 113.6
Aor. preṣayi Mv ii.55.9; apreṣaye Mv i.128.16 (§§ 32.5, 89)

īkṣ-, see: (1) *īkṣa-ti* (Skt.), also *īkṣaya-ti*, non-caus., and *ud-ikṣati* (Dict.)
Pres. prekṣima (ed. °ṣiya) LV 367.13 (§ 27.10); opt. parīkṣeya Mv ii.67.7; impv. upekṣahi LV 178.6; prekṣasu (? § 30.16) LV 322.20; nirīkṣayātha LV 50.10; pple. samudīkṣayanto LV 134.4
Aor. upekṣi LV 172.18 (2 sg.); nirīkṣī LV 230.4; udikṣiṣu LV 114.18; udvīkṣeyaṃ (1 sg.) Mv ii.194.6 (§ 32.105); udikṣiṣu (Dict.)
Ger. pratyavekṣitvā Mv i.275.19; samīkṣiyāna Mv i.278.20

(2) *-īkṣya-ti*, *-te*: not recorded elsewhere; phonetic corruption?
Pres. vīkṣyasi RP 7.2; upaparīkṣyanti Divy 220.9, 15; parīkṣyate Divy 407.5; opt. upaparīkṣyeta Laṅk 214.13; pple. nirīkṣyamāṇaḥ Divy 408.8

īr- (*ir-*), move (intrans.), act: (1) irya-ti: Pali iriyati (cf. Vedic īr-te; ya-present due to influence of noun īryāpatha, or iryā-?)
Pres. iryasi Mv iii.118.18 (mss.)

(2) caus. (transitive) *īraya-ti* (Skt.), also *ira-ti*
Pres. pple.: irantaḥ Gv 372.13 (§ 38.30)
opt. udīrayed (2 sg.) Mv i.84.16; impv. udīrehi LV 185.16
Aor. udīrayī Mv i.67.3; °yi Mv i.205.1; °ye Mv ii.54.4; °yetsuḥ Mv i.229.12; udīrinsuḥ Mv iii.354.16
Ger. udīryana Gv 255.9 (§ 35.46)

ujjha-ti, abandon (Skt.)
Aor. (or Pres.?) ujjhesi Mv iii.295.7, 9 (in 9 v.l. ujhyasi)
Ger. ujjhitvā Mv ii.197.13; ujjhiya SP 286.12; ujjhiyāna Mv ii.13.2

utkaṇṭha-ti, long for (Skt.), denom.; also *utkaṇṭhe-ti*
Pres. opt. utkaṇṭheyā (could be derived from either) Mv ii.429.8; impv. utkaṇṭhehi Mv iii.167.9; utkaṇṭhāhi Mv ii.274.12

utkrośaya-ti, exalt (denom.; Dict.)
Pres. °ti AsP 419.4

udānaya-ti, make a joyful utterance, denom.: Pali udāneti
Pres. udānayati LV 103.13
Aor. udānayī Gv 489.11; °ye Mv i.351.13; °yetsu(ḥ) Mv i.340.14; udānesi Mv ii.286.1

uṣ-, burn (Skt.)
Ppp. uṣita- SP 85.9 (Dict.)

ūṣmāya-ti, steam: denom. (Skt.)
Aor. ūṣmāyetsu(ḥ) Mv ii.124.4, 5, 8

ūha-ti, remove (Skt.)
Aor. samūhetsuḥ Mv ii.125.6

ṛ-: Caus. *arpaya-ti*, deliver, hand over (Skt.); *appe-ti*
Pres. impv. appehi Mv iii.295.2 (? uncertain: if correct, MIndic for arp-)

ṛtīya-te, or *ritīya-te* = *artīyati*, above: perhaps false Sktization from a MIndic form like Pali aṭṭīyati. Only in Bbh; usually printed rit°
Pres. ritīyate Bbh 168.23; opt. (a)ritīyeran, see artīyati; pple. ṛtīyamāna- (after -ā) Bbh 166.11; ritīyamāna- (after -aṃ) Bbh 171.9

ṛdh-, succeed: (1) *ṛdhya-te*, *-ti* (Skt.), also spelled *ridh°*
Pres. ridhyate RP 59.4; opt. ṛdhyeya Mv i.299.14; ṛdhyā (§ 29.42) Mv iii.335.18; 336.7; impv. ṛ(d)dhyahi (?) LV 178.10; ridhyatu (v.l. ṛdh°) Bhad 15

(2) *ṛddha-ti*, denom. to ppp. ṛddha- (§ 28.19)
Pres. mid. prārdhadhve Divy 146.11 (? see Dict.)
Fut. ṛddhiṣyati (v.l. riddh°), will succeed, Divy 102.9

oḍḍe-ti, (a) fasten, especially (b) lay (a snare): = Pali uḍḍeti in sense (a), oḍḍeti in sense (b). Sense (a) only in Mv ii.75.21
Pres. oḍḍeti Mv ii.252.16; pple. oḍḍentasya Mv ii.253.9
Ppp. oḍḍita- Mv ii.75.21 (read oḍḍitā for occhritā with v.l., see Senart's Crit. App. on 74.8); ii.235.1, 6; 251.1, 8 ff.; 253.11
Ger. oḍḍitvā Mv ii.252.17

kaṭṭa-ti, draw: corresponds to Pali kaḍḍhati, Skt. kṛṣ; regularly emended to kaḍḍh- by Senart in Mv; once (SP 84.1) apparently *kaḍḍh-* occurs
Pres. okaṭṭati Mv iii.29.13, 15, 16; parikaṭṭati Mv ii.255.17, 18; ākaṭṭāmi Megh 306.17; opt. okaṭṭiyā (mss.) Mv iii.30.8; pple. vikaḍḍhamāna- (so, no v.l.) SP 84.1
Ppp. kaṭṭita- Mv ii.75.3, 11; okaṭṭita- Mv iii.29.17; 34.10 (here mss. °tum); utkaṭṭita- (mss. utkaṇṭh°, so Senart, or utkarita-) Mv ii.249.11; ukkaṭṭita- (mss., for utk°) Mv iii.431.7
Ger. saṃkaṭṭitvā Mv i.302.15; ukkaṭṭetvā (for utk°) Mv iii.158.13; niṣkaṭṭiya (so, see Dict.) Mv ii.242.12
Inf. avakaṭṭitum Mv iii.30.6; okaṭṭitum Mv iii.30.10; 34.8
Pass. kaṭṭiyanti Mv ii.241.18; okaṭṭiyanti Mv iii.30.3; pple. kaṭṭīyantiye Mv i.217.7; okaṭṭiyanto (mss.) Mv iii.30.4; kaṭṭīyamānī (v.l. kaṭṭi°) Mv ii.429.15

kathaya-ti, say, denom. (Skt.)
Pres. opt. katheyā SP 283.15; katheyuḥ Sukh 74.18; kathayesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.200.1; impv. kathayāhi SP 209.8 (v.l. °yesi)
Aor. kathe Mv iii.408.15; kathesi Mv iii.461.7; kathaye Mv i.312.9; kathayetsuḥ Mv iii.356.2
Pass. kathīyati Mv ii.17.4

kamp-, shake, intrans.: (1) *kampa-ti* (Skt.), also *kampaya-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. kampayati Mv iii.341.7 (§ 38.21); impv. anukampāhi Mv ii.230.14
Aor. kampi Mv i.64.10; saṃprakampayiṣu SP 270.12

(Kashgar rec.; § 32.30); kampe Mv i.40.7; kampeya (mss.) Mv ii.413.1 (§ 32.105); kampesi Mv ii.33.18; prakampire Mmk 512.19 (3 sg.); 548.3 (3 pl.), § 32.43
(2) Caus. *kampaya-ti*, shake (trans., Skt.)
Aor. kampayi (1 sg.) Gv 231.15; prakampesi Mv ii.300.15

kas-, go (Skt., Gr. except in some cpds.): (1) *-kasa-ti*
Ppp. okasta-, gone down, entered into, Mv i.245.4 etc. (cf. Ved. vikasta-)
(2) *-kāsa-ti*: recorded nowhere else
Pres. niṣkāsati, goes forth, Mv i.361.3 (§ 28.33; Dict.)
(3) Caus. *(niṣ-)kāsaya-ti*, expel (Skt.)
Ger. niṣkāsiya Mv ii.174.11
Caus. Inf. niṣkāsāpayitum, to cause to be expelled, Divy 339.6

kāṅkṣ-, doubt (in Skt. and here in cpds., desire): (1) *kāṅkṣa-ti*: = Pali kaṅkhati
Pres. kāṅkṣanti Mv i.85.12; impv. (§ 30.16) kāṅkṣiṣu Mv ii.55.21
(2) *-kāṅkṣaya-ti* = kāṅkṣati
Pres. impv. ākāṅkṣayatha, doubt, Sukh 99.6; abhikāṅkṣayāhi, desire, Mv ii.147.12 (so mss.)
(3) **kāṅkṣāya-ti*, doubt, implied in:
Ppp. kāṅkṣāyita-(tva-, tā) = Pali kaṅkhāyita-; -tva- Av i.228.6 ff.; AsP 454.9; -tā- AsP 454.10; § 38.38

kāma-ti, love: Skt. kāmayati, Pali kāmeti
Pres. kāmasi Mv ii.483.8; impv. kāmāhi Sādh 162.11

kāś-, also spelled *kās-*, appear: (1) *kāśa-te, -ti* (Skt.)
Aor. vītikāśetsuḥ Mv ii.125.14
(2) Caus. *kāśayati* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. prakāśeyā SP 237.2; °śeyyā Mv i.336.20; prakāśayeyā SP 284.11; prakāśayesi (2 sg.) SP 98.2
Aor. prakāśayī SP 23.10; 193.4; °ye Mv i.188.7

kāsa-te, -ti, cough (Skt.)
Aor. ukkāsi (for utk°) Mv ii.281.13, 18 (v.l. in both °se); ukkāse id. 14 (v.l. °si), 15

kīrtaya-ti, celebrate, denom. (Skt.)
Pres. opt. anukīrtaye (2 sg.) Mv i.77.8
Aor. kīrteṣy (2 sg., § 32.63, 65) SP 63.9; kīrtaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.441.7

kuccha-ti, abuse (MIndic for Skt. kutsati, which is used rarely for kutsayati)
Pres. kucchanti Mv i.106.9

kuṭṭaya-ti, bruise (Skt.)
Pass. pple. kuṭṭīyantā Mv i.6.5

(ut-)kumbha-ti, rears (of a horse; denom.?)
Pres. °ti KP 108.2

kṛ- make, do: (1) *karo-ti, kuru-te* (Skt.)
Pres. kurumi (§ 28.64) LV 56.11; kurumī LV 221.1; karoma (§ 28.62) SP 116.9; karonti LV 195.10; opt. kurya (§ 29.42) SP 157.12; kuryāsi (2 sg.; § 29.36) Mv i.276.8; impv. karohi (v.l. karotha) SP 113.14; kuruhi (§ 30.9) Mv i.275.22; karotha Mv i.245.7; karontu Mv i.295.1; pple. karontāś SP 83.14
Aor. satkarosi gurukarosi (3 sg.) Mv i.59.14 f. (mss.); § 32.70
(2) *kara-ti*: Pali id., Pkt. karai; based on fut. kariṣyati (Pali karissati), § 28.13
Pres. opt. satkare Mv ii.370.21; satkareta SP 228.14; kari (1 sg.) Bhad 58; kareya LV 335.19; kareyyā Mv ii.144.10; satkareyyāsi (2 sg.; § 29.38) Śikṣ 100.17; pple. alaṃkaratā (instr. sg.) Śikṣ 341.18; karamāṇa- Bhad 38.57
Fut. 1 sg. kariṣyaṃ Mv ii.274.13; °ṣya LV 178.4
Aor. akari Mv i.268.7; akare Mv iii.45.18; (a)karensu(ḥ) Mv iii.96.17; 365.13; vyākaretsuḥ Mv i.57.10; karinsu (with Kashgar rec.) SP 50.3 ff.; akarimha Mv iii.434.2 (§ 32.40)
Ppp. samalaṃkarita- Śikṣ 327.16
Ger. karitvā SP 229.8; °tvāna Mv iii.97.20; °tvana Samādh 22.4; karia (§ 35.38) Śikṣ 299.8; kariya LV 243.12; kariyāṇa (°na) SP 222.1; Mv ii.388.4; kari LV 200.9
Inf. saṃskaritum Divy 207.24
Gdve. satkaritavya- Mv i.37.3
Pass. karīyati Mv i.269.3; kariyati LV 185.6; impv. karīyatu Mv iii.360.1
Caus. opt. karāpayet KP 158.7 (? § 38.53)
(3) *kurva-ti*, also *-kurvaya-ti* (non-caus.): Pali kubbati, AMg. kuvvai; § 28.6
Pres. kurvāmi SP 125.14; kurvamī LV 195.22; kurvasi Sukh 52.6; kurvati SP 28.8; KP 7.7; kurvāmaḥ Kv 47.18; kurvatha Mv iii.293.16; kurvate (3 sg.) Suv 144.8; kurvāmahe LV 276.2; impv. vikurva Mmk 55.26; kurvahi LV 178.6; kurvatu Suv 57.12; pple. jihmīkurvamāṇa- Gv 87.5
Pres. in -aya- (§ 38.21), pple. vikurvayato (= *vikurvantaḥ*) Gv 267.3
Aor. kurvī Mv i.223.19; vikurvī Śikṣ 347.6; kurviṣu SP 10.6; vikurviṣu Mv i.64.3; kurvansu Mv iii.294.11 (§ 32.76)
Ppp. vikurvita- (as noun, miracle) LV 119.8 etc.
Ger. kurvi Mv i.236.12 (? § 35.50)
Inf. vikurvitu-kāma- Samādh p. 6, line 23
(4) *kāraya-ti*, in sense of simplex, not usually caus.; so regularly Pali kāreti, and often Skt. (BR 2.87); § 38.57
Pres. opt. kāraye (2 sg.) Mv iii.20.9; in sense of causative passive (§ 37.17), kārayeyaṃ SP 113.3
Fut. opt. kārayiṣyet Mv i.267.9 (§ 31.37)
Aor. akārimha (1 pl.) Mv iii.434.2 (§ 32.40); kārayesi, v.l. °yasi (§ 32.62; 3 sg.) Mv ii.64.15; kāresi Mv i.304.12; kārayesi Mv i.49.10, 13; kārayetsu(ḥ) Mv i.259.6
Caus. kārāpayanti (§ 38.57) SP 15.3; °penti Mv i.26.15; opt. °payet KP 159.12; °payi SP 114.11; °payesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.486.5; impv. °pehi Mv ii.73.18; pple. °payamāna- Mv i.96.6;—Fut. °payiṣyaṃ Mv i.325.17;—Aor. °payi SP 114.11; °payīṣū or °payiṃsū (§ 32.35) SP 50.16; °pesi Mv iii.442.3; °payet Mv ii.116.1;—Ppp. °pita- SP 50.14 etc.; in non-caus. mg., LV 215.9, § 38.62;—Ger. °payitvā Mv i.52.13; °payi SP 152.5
(5) Miscellaneous forms
Pres. opt. krāyur Mv i.69.18 (? § 29.47); (impv. kruhi, and similar forms, probably errors of tradition, see Dict. s.v. kruhi)
Fut. (§ 31.18) kāhiti Mv ii.41.20; °tī (ms.) Śikṣ 101.6; kāhi (3 sg.; v.l. kāhiti) SP 154.8; kāhisi (2 sg.) Mv ii.238.9; kāhinti Mv i.256.6; kāhāma Mv ii.229.15
Aor. akāriṣuḥ Gv 334.25 (§ 32.46); (a)kāsi (§§ 32.49, 56) Mv i.242.12; vyākārṣi (§ 32.74; 2 sg.) Mv iii.401.10; vyākarṣi (3 sg.) Mv iii.139.10; °ṣīt (? text vyākarṣitaś) LV 39.19; vyākariṣi (mss. vyāka-ṛṣi, Senart viyākarṣi) Mv ii.193.12; vyākarṣu (3 pl.) SP 27.3; karṣu (ed. em. kariṣu) LV 368.12; vyākarṣa (? 2 sg., § 32.74) Mv iii.386.6; kṛtāsi (§ 32.61) SP 51.6
Ger. -kārakam Mv i.339.16 (§ 35.5); kṛtā ? LV 356.6 (§ 35.53)
Inf. kṛtum Suv 156.4 (§ 36.9)

kṛ-, scatter: (1) *kira-ti* (Skt.)
Fut. prākiriṣyanti (read pra°?) Mv iii.324.8; vikiriṣyase LV 335.7

Aor. avakiri Sukh 24.18; abhyokirī (so read) Suv 150.6; okire (1 sg.) Mv iii.248.8; abhikirişu Dbh.g. 30(56).1; okiresi (but cf. -kireti) Mv i.38.9; prakiretsuḥ Mv i.211.18
Ppp. prakirita- Mmk 76.16
Ger. prakiritvā Mv i.211.20; abhyokiriyāṇa SP 191.2, 7; abhyokiri SP 325.4; 228.15 (? perhaps opt.); avakiri Mv ii.333.11
(2) *-kire-ti, -kiraya-ti*, non-caus.: Pali also pakireti = pakirati (wrongly called caus. in PTSD)
Pres. prakireti Mv ii.252.1, 16; °enti Mv i.211.20; okirenti Mv ii.304.3; pple. prakirentasya Mv ii.253.10; vikirayamāṇa- Gv 87.8; 89.11
(3) *-kīra-ti* or *-te*: so, rarely, in Pali, see CPD s.v. abhikirati; §§ 28.34; 34.10; 37.28
Pres. pple. abhyavakīramāṇa-, strewing (flowers), Gv 430.3
Ppp. abhyavakīrita-, bestrewn, Mmk 63.25
(4) **-kara-ti*?
Aor. samakarī Dbh.g. 48(74).11 (? 3 pl.; very uncertain; § 32.16)

kṛt-: **karta-ti*, twist: AMg. kattai, pres. pple. kattanta-; in Skt., chiefly Vedic, kṛṇatti, Pali kantati; Skt. ppp. kartita, ger. kartya, once each in Hariv., BR 5.1259. Are our and the AMg. forms based on the like of these?
Fut. kartiṣyanti Divy 213.5
Ppp. su-kartita- Mmk 57.7
Inf. kartitum Divy 213.2
Caus. opt. kartāpayet Mmk 57.7

kṛṣ-, drag: (1) *karṣa-ti* (Skt.) and (non-caus.) *karṣaya-ti* (which in Skt. too appears to be used in the sense of karṣati, trans.)
Pres. parikarṣayati Divy 475.14; avakarṣayanti SP 159.12
Ger. apakarṣitvā Mv ii.75.5
Pass. apakarṣīyate Mv i.302.15
(2) *kṛṣa-ti* (Skt.)
Fut. kṛṣiṣyanti Divy 212.17
(3) Miscellaneous
Fut. ākṛkṣyata (ms., em. ākarkṣyataḥ) MSV ii.65.20 (§ 31.23)

kḷp-: *kalpa-ti, -te*, and *kalpaya-ti, kalpe-ti*, be adapted (intrans., in Skt. so only the simplex); arrange (in Skt. so virtually only the caus.); trim (hair, etc.; caus.); in BHS both aya and a forms occur with both meanings
Pres. kalpenti Mv i.135.1, 10 (intrans., are adapted); opt. kalpeya SP 344.2 (trans., would arrange)
Aor. (trans.) kalpesi Mv iii.42.12; ii.234.10; kalpayesi Mv ii.233.9; prakalpaye (v.l. °yet) Mv iii.45.2
Caus. ger. kalpāpayitvā, having had trimmed, Mv ii.489.8

kelāya-ti (also recorded as *kelay°*), care for, cherish, tend, clean up: Pali id., Pkt. kelāyai; Dict.
Pres. kelāyanti Divy 631.5; opt. kelāyeyuḥ AsP 253.13; pple. kelāyantī (mss. °nti) Mv iii.154.13
Ppp. kelāyita- Mmk 52.14; 81.26; Dbh 39.22; AsP 253.13
Inf. kelayitum (so text, read kelā°?) LV 100.9 (prose)
Gdve. kelāyitavya- Mvy 2591
Caus. ger. kelāpayitvā Mmk 708.28 (so, or kela°, read for text kailapayitvā; prose)

koṭaya-ti, strike (once recorded -koṭh°): Pali (ā)koṭeti; cf. Skt. kuṭṭayati, kuṭa-
Pres. koṭayati Divy 115.27; opt. ākoṭayet Mvy 9260; ākoṭhayed (so recorded) Prāt 491.8; utkoṭayet (Dict.) Prāt 503.4; impv. ākoṭaya Av i.18.8
Ppp. koṭita- Divy 115.27; LV 236.9; ākoṭita- Divy 335.13
Ger. ākoṭayitvā AsP 289.7
Gdve. koṭayitavya- Divy 114.22
Pass. impv. ākoṭyatām Av i.258.9; pple. ākoṭyamāna- LV 299.10

kranda-ti, cry (Skt.)
Aor. krandiṣu SP 84.12; vikrande Mv i.347.9; krandetsuḥ — Mv iii.409.9

kram-, stride: (1) *krama-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. upasaṃkrami (1 sg.) Bhad 35; krame SP 293.5; niṣkrameyā LV 201.21; ākrameyyā LV 199.15; impv. abhiniṣkramāhi Mv ii.141.2
Aor. niṣkrami (followed by ti = iti, so divide) LV 133.13; prakrami Mv i.255.4; niṣkramī LV 92.12; niṣkramet Mv i.303.11; prakrame (3 pl.) Mv iii.339.6; upasaṃkraminsu Hoernle MR 152 for SP 270.11; upasaṃkrameyuḥ Mv i.36.8 (§ 32.105); prakramensuḥ (v.l. °tsuḥ) Mv i.212.13
Ger. abhiniṣkramitvā SP 68.8; Mv i.358.7; upasamkramī SP 11.11; 191.1
Caus. (Ppp. abhiniṣkramita- LV 187.4; § 38.9;) Ppp. ākramāpita- (? em.) or ākrāmāpita- (Dict.) Mv iii.363.9
(2) *-krame-ti*, non-caus. = kramati
Pres. ākramesi Mv ii.408.18; upakramemi Mv ii.459.16
Inf. parākrametum LV 134.2; atikrametum LV 134.7 (§ 36.8)
(3) *krāma-ti* (Skt.), also *krāmaya-ti*, **krāme-ti*, non-caus. (In Gv 72.3, prose, read with 2d ed. upasaṃkrāmanti for 1st ed. °krānti.)
Pres. avakrāmayati LV 400.14
Impf. upāsaṃkrāmat, °man, see § 32.5
Aor. prakrāmi Mv i.256.16; 323.11
Ger. okrāmetvā Mv iii.318.15; parākrāmya (§ 35.12) Ud xi.1
(4) *-kramya-ti, -te*: Pali 2 sg. impv. paṭikamma, Geiger 136.1 (cf. Skt. Gr. krāmyati)
Pres. ākramyate Divy 399.25; impv. upasaṃkramya (mss.) Mv i.330.13; niṣkramyā LV 163.20; 164.11; ākramyā LV 163.21; niṣkramyāhī LV 161.22; 162.10
Aor. niṣkramye Mv ii.198.13 (v.l. niṣkrame; meter equally good)
(5) *caṅkrama-ti*, intens.: Pali caṅkamati (Skt. caṅkramyate, very rarely °mati; for Mbh. Calc. 1.7919 caṅkramamāṇau, cited BR, the Crit. ed. reads caṅkramya°, 1.211.14); §§ 28.13, 30
Pres. anucaṅkramāmi SP 55.1; °manti SP 84.8; opt. caṅkrami SP 344.1; °med LV 369.1; °meta SP 98.10; anucaṅkramanto, pr. pple. n. sg., SP 61.10 etc.
Aor. caṅkramī LV 368.16; °miṣu Mv i.189.8; °me Mv i.317.9; anu-°metsuḥ Mv iii.282.5
Ger. anucaṅkramitvā Mv ii.455.16; 456.21

krī-, buy: (1) *krīṇa-ti*: apparently not in Pali, but Pkt. has forms in kī- beside more usual ki-; based on Skt. 3 pl. krīṇanti
Pres. vikrīṇati Mv ii.241.15; 274.1 (both prose, no v.l.; in 274.1 Senart em. °ṇāti)
Fut. krīṇiṣyati Mv ii.242.1 (v.l. krīṇīṣyati)
Gdve. krīṇitavya- (v.l. kri°) Mv ii.274.2 (prose)
(2) *kriṇa-ti*, once *kriṇe-ti*: Pali kiṇati, § 28.5
Pres. kriṇāmi, vikriṇāmi Mv ii.49.15; kriṇenti Mv i.91.10 (so 5 mss.; Senart, kriṇanti with one inferior ms.); impv. kriṇātu Mv ii.87.16 (prose)
Ger. kriṇitvā Mv i.335.10 (prose; Senart em. krī°); kriṇiya Mv ii.241.17 (prose)
Inf. vikriṇitum Mv ii.87.15 (prose; v.l. vikrīṇītum!)
Gdve., see under krīṇati (1)
(3) *(vi-)kre-ti*: AMg. vikkei (vikkeha); § 28.49
Pres. vikrenti SP 280.4
Ger. vikreya MSV ii.143.7 (ms.; ed. em. **vikrīya**); § 35.21
(Inf. vikretum, Skt.:) so read Mv ii.88.6 (§ 36.8); Pali also has vikketuṃ

(4) Pass. *vi-krāya-ti* (or *-te*?), be sold: AMg. pple. vikkāyamāṇa-; cf. also JM. active pple. vikkanta-, selling (Sheth); origin doubtful, § 37.39
Pres. opt. vikrāyetsuḥ, would be sold, Mv ii.241.20
Fut. vikrāyiṣyati (vikra°? see Dict. s.v. vikrāyati) and vikrāsyati, will be sold, Mv ii.242.14 and 11 (§ 31.2, 3)

krīḍa-ti, play (Skt.), also *krīḍaya-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. krīḍitaḥ Divy 404.18 (3 dual; § 27.10); opt. krīḍeyyā Mv ii.144.9; impv. krīḍāhi Mv ii.103.6 krīḍayanti LV 75.17; pple. krīḍayantam LV 157.7
Aor. krīḍiṣu SP 50.12; krīḍetsu Mv i.194.17
Ger. krīḍitvā Mv ii.111.16
Caus. krīḍāpayati Mmk 458.20; impv. krīḍāpetha Mv i.227.12

kruś-, cry out: (1) *krośa-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. krośire Mmk 584.22 (§ 32.43); vikrośe Mv i.347.9
(2) Miscellaneous (see also *utkrośaya-ti*)
Fut. (§ 31.23; krokṣyati, Skt. Gr.) ākrokṣyanti Divy 38.11, 14; pratikrokṣyanti AsP 179.4

krūḍ-, roast (read kūḍ-?)
Pass. parikrūḍyante, are roasted, LV 207.10 (Dict.)

klam-, grow weary: (1) *klama-ti* = Pali kilamati
Pres. pariklamanti MPS 31.56
(2) *kilamya-ti*, blend of klāmyati and prec.
Pres. impv. kilamyatu Mv iii.175.3
(3) Caus. *klāmaya-ti*, weary (Skt.), also *klāma-ti* (caus. or non-caus. mg.)
Pres. kilāmasi for klāmasi = klāmayasi Mv ii.483.9; opt. kilāmaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.19.15; non-caus. mg., opt. klāmed MSV ii.85.1 (= Skt. klāmyed)

(*klambh-*, false reading, see Dict. s.v. viklambh-)

klid-, caus. *kledaya-ti*, moisten (Skt.)
Ger. kledayitvāna Mv iii.7.19

kṣan-, injure (Skt.)
Pass. (§ 37.30) kṣaṇyate Śikṣ 187.8; kṣaṇyati, and opt. kṣaṇyema Śikṣ 92.3 and 1

kṣama-ti, endure (Skt.)
Pres. opt. kṣame SP 334.15; kṣameyā Mv i.285.1; impv. kṣamāhi Mv iii.23.8
Caus. kṣamāpayanti LV 379.6; °penti Mv iii.359.10; opt. °peyaṃ (v.l. °payeyaṃ) Mv i.37.8; Ger. °payitvā LV 38.14

kṣi-, destroy: (1) *kṣaya-ti* (once in Rām.): Sheth cites Pkt. (Gram.) khaai as intrans.; § 28.39
Inf. kṣayitu Dbh.g. 41(67).8, and kṣayītum Śikṣ 345.10, both m.c. for kṣayitum (§§ 36.2, 4, 6)
(2) Pass. *kṣīya-te* (Skt.); kṣīyati (? Dict.) Mv ii.480.2, 4
Fut. kṣīyihanti (§ 31.2) Mv ii.53.14
(3) Caus. *kṣapaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. kṣapaye Mv ii.93.13; kṣapeya SP 111.14
Inf. kṣapaṇāya Mv ii.362.8

kṣip-, throw: (1) *kṣipa-ti* (Skt.), also **kṣipaya-ti*, **kṣipe-ti*, non-caus. (see Ger. below)
Pres. opt. upanikṣipe Mv ii.365.1; nikṣipi SP 158.1; abhyutkṣipeyā Mv ii.315.9
Fut. kṣipiṣyati LV 145.14 (so with most mss., ed. kṣap°)
Aor. kṣipī LV 387.7; parikṣipi Mv iii.301.6; kṣipe Mv ii.337.3; 338.5; kṣipiṣus (§ 32.36) LV 282.16; kṣipiṃsū LV 81.7; kṣipetsu(ḥ) Mv i.342.13
Ger. kṣipitvā SP 58.14; °tva SP 55.7; kṣipitvāna (mss.) Mv ii.92.5; abhyutkṣipitvāna(?) Mv ii.329.2; kṣipiyā Mv ii.391.1; kṣipiyāna Mv i.241.2; nikṣipayitvā (? mss.; read °petva?) Mv i.241.1; nikṣipetvā Mv ii.65.4 (§ 35.26; Senart em. °itvā)
Inf. nikṣipitum Mv iii.428.4
Gdve. prakṣipitavya- Mmk 695.1
Caus. opt. kṣipāpayet Mmk 528.27; Gdve. kṣipāpayitavya- Mmk 49.19
(2) Miscellaneous forms
Aor. akṣaipsīt (v.l. kṣipataḥ; § 32.79) SP 468.7
Perf. cikṣepur LV 7.14 (§ 33.4)
Inf. utkṣiptum Divy 279.2 (§ 36.9)

kṣuya-te or *kṣū°*, shake (trans.)
Pres. pple. saṃkṣuyamāno, or °kṣū° Mv ii.268.12 ff. (?see Dict.)

kṣubh-, quake: (1) *kṣubhya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. kṣubhye Mv ii.162.5
(2) **kṣubha-ti*: Pali (*saṃ*)*khubhati*; cf. Ppp. Skt. kṣubhita-, AMg. khuhia-
Caus. kṣubhayanti LV 339.13

khana-ti, dig (Skt.), also *-khane-ti*, non-caus.; once *khaṇ-*, as in Pali (below under Caus. Ppp.)
Pres. anukhaneti, parikhaneti Mv iii.301.16; opt. nikhaneyā (1 sg.) Mv ii.436.3
Ppp. khanita- Divy 16.4
Ger. parikhanya (or pali°) Mv iii.284.18
Caus. opt. utkhanāpeyā (so read) Mv ii.436.4; Fut. utkhanāpayiṣyaṃ Mv ii.437.13; Ppp. utkhanāpita- Mv ii.437.16; su-khaṇapita-, mss., read °khaṇā°, Divy 71.5; Ger. khanāpayitvā Mv i.352.21; Pass. pple. utkhanāpiyamāna- Mv ii.439.6

khara-ti, flow, MIndic for kṣar-: AMg. kharai; cf. also *ghṛ-*
Pres. pple. prākharantaḥ (v.l. pra°) SP 126.8

khala-ti, see *skhala-ti*

khalakhalāya-ti, rattle (onomat.): cf. JM. khalakhalei (Jacobi Erz. 48.9)
Pres. °yati Mv i.172.3

khād-, eat: (1) *khāda-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. khādesi (2 sg.) Mv iii.7.4, 8; impv. khādāhi Mv iii.159.9
Ger. khāditva (Epic Skt. °tvā) SP 84.5; khādiya Mv iii.4.16
Caus. impv. khādāpaya Mmk 56.26; Ppp. khādāpita- Mv i.24.16
(2) *khāya-ti* (MIndic): Pkt. khāyai, and Pali ppp. khāyita- (§§ 2.32; 32.23)
Aor. khāyi Mv iii.299.11
Ppp. khāyita- Mv iii.84.17
(3) Pass. *khajja-ti*, MIndic for khādyate: Pali id. (§ 2.14)
Pres. khajjāmi Mv ii.450.6, 8; 452.8, 11; opt. khajje Mv iii.252.15; khajjeya Mv ii.78.1
Fut. khajjiṣyasi Mv ii.78.4; °ṣyatha Mv iii.290.17

khid-, be afflicted: (1) *khijja-ti*, MIndic for khidyate: not in PTSD, cited in Childers from Clough; Pkt. khijjai (§ 2.14)
Pres. khijjante Mv ii.457.13; pple. a-khijjantam Mv ii.252.15; khijjantasya Mv ii.253.9, 13
Ger. khijjitvā Mv ii.252.14
(2) Caus. *khedaya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. khedayī (2 sg.) LV 221.8

khurda-ti, leap, or sport, play: Skt. kūrd-, for which Dhātup. khurd- or khūrd- (Prob. not related to AMg. khuḍḍai, break)
Pres. impv. khurda Mmk 28.15

(*ā-*)*khyā-*, tell: (1) *ākhyāya-ti*, act., tell; § 37.23; Dict.
Pres. impv. ākhyāyatha, relate! Mv ii.437.3 (prose)
(2) *ākhyā-ti*, Skt. (**ākhya-ti*? cf. Skt. ākhyat, imperf.)
Aor. ākhyāsi (§ 32.54) Mv i.9.6; as future(?) Mv iii.451.6 (§ 32.123); samākhyetsu Mv iii.85.5 (§ 32.104)

gaḍ- = *gal-*, with *vi-*, disappear, fall down (vi-gal-, Skt.)
Ppp. vigaḍita- SP 72.5

gaṇaya-ti, reckon (Skt.)
Pres. opt. gaṇeya LV 338.7; impv. gaṇayāhi Mv iii.265.5
[Ger. gaṇetu? § 35.55]

gam-, go: (1) *gaccha-ti*, also *gacchaya-ti*, *gacche-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. gacchayamī LV 223.1; opt. gacche Mv i.274.18; āgacche (2 sg.) Mv ii.90.2; gaccheyā LV 201.14; gaccheya Mv i.258.13; gacchesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.42.17; gacchāsi (2 sg., supposed 'subjunctive', § 27.8) Mv i.157.3; ii.194.11; impv. gacchehi (mss.) Mv i.187.1; gacchāhi Mv i.362.11; gacchahi (v.l. °ehi) Mv i.288.1
Aor. gacchi LV 133.13; gacchī LV 81.11; gacchiṣu LV 74.6; gacchisu Śikṣ 347.2; āgacchasi (1 sg.; § 32.62) Mv ii.133.4; paryadhigacchasi (3 sg.) Mv i.188.3; atyudgacchet (ed. em. abhy°) Mv i.229.16; āgacche Mv i.221.7; āgaccheyur (§ 32.105) Mmk 130.23; gacchensu Mv iii.373.21; pratyudgacchetsu(ḥ) Mv i.259.12
Ger. gacchitvā Mv iii.142.16; gacchiya Mv i.362.13
Inf. gacchitum Samādh p. 30 line 31
Pass. Pple. anugacchiyamāna- Mv ii.101.15
(2) *gama-ti*: AMg. gamai; § 28.12
Pres. opt. āgame Mv ii.141.7; °meyā LV 232.18; °mesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.199.20; upagami Mv ii.387.15
Fut. impv. gamiṣyatu Divy 220.10 (§ 31.37)
Aor. agamā (§ 32.112) Mv i.220.10 (3 sg.); iii.12.5 (so read; 1 sg.); upāgamā Mv ii.53.19 (so read; 3 pl.); gami Sukh 51.16; āgamī Mv iii.306.12; adhyagame Mv iii.191.4; upagaminsu (v.l. °tsu) LV 94.21; agamittha (? § 32.42) Mv iii.415.9; agamāsi (§32.59) Mv iii.12.2; upagamensuḥ (°metsuḥ) Mv i.224.6 = ii.27.6
Ger. āgamitvā Gv 190.4; gamiyāna SP 157.13; upāgami Mv i.3.3 (mss.)
Inf. gamanāya SP 187.5; gamanāye Mv i.362.15
(3) *gamaya-ti*, *game-ti*, non-caus., = *gamati*
Pres. impv. āgamaya Divy 76.10 = 465.10; °yata Divy 534.12; āgamehi (could be entered under gamati) Mv ii.31.20; °metu Mv iii.263.17
Aor. upāgamesi Mv i.4.2; 246.14 (could be entered under gamati, cf. § 32.67)
(4) Miscellaneous forms
Fut. gaṃsati (gans°) Mv iii.85.16 etc. (§ 31.29); once abhigaṃsye (1 sg.) Mv ii.144.3
Aor. (? § 32.77) pratyudgatāsuḥ, or °tānsuḥ Mv i.35.5; udgatāsuḥ Mv i.222.12
Ger. adhigantuṃ LV 245.19 (§ 35.54)

garja-ti, *-te*, roar (Skt.)
Aor. nigarjasu (3 sg., read °si? § 32.62) Gv 259.23; abhigarje Mv ii.270.1, 19; abhigarjetsuḥ Mv ii.293.12
Caus. (not in Wh. Roots) pple. nigarjayamāna- Gv 272.26

garhaya-ti, censure, non-caus. (in Skt. also = garhati)
Gdve. vigarhayitavya- Divy 115.7

gal- (or *gṛ-*, *gar-*), swallow: *-gala-ti* (or *-gara-ti*), for normal Skt. gilati, girati (garati Dhātup., very rare and doubtful in literature); AMg. galai
Pres. pple. nirgaranto, or (best mss.) nirgalanto LV 306.21 (prose), spitting forth

gaveṣ-, seek: (1) *gaveṣa-te*, *gaveṣaya-ti* (both Skt.)
Aor. samagaveṣi (v.l. °ṣī) Mv ii.205.2; gaveṣi (so with mss., followed by yaṃ) Mv ii.220.14
(2) *gaveṣya*(*ya*)*-ti*; cf. Pali gavessatha Dhp. 146
Fut. gaveṣyayiṣyati AsP 113.6

1 *gā-*, go (Skt.) No present *gāti is recorded; Skt. agāt
Aor. anvagā (§ 32.106; 1 sg.) Mv iii.457.15

2 *gā-*, sing: *gāya-ti* (Skt.); rarely Skt. *gāti*; Pali *gāhi*, Jāt. iii.507.25
Aor. gāye Mv ii.268.10; gāyetsu Mv ii.161.1
Inf. gāyitum MSV iv.240.22
Caus. gāyāpayati MSV iii.16.6
(Aor. Vedic agāsīt:) agāsi Mv i.130.6 (§§ 28.55; 32.54)

gāha-te, *-ti* (Skt.), plunge; also *-gāhaya-te*, *-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. pple. vigāhayamāna- Gv 476.4; Bhad 39
Aor. avagāhi Mv ii.222.4; °hiṣu Mv i.11.1; °hitha (3 pl., § 32.42) Mv i.11.5
Ger. a-paryavagāhitvā Mv iii.153.2; 167.5; °hetvā Mv iii.165.11; 170.7 (mss.); ogāhetvāna Mv iii.289.1
Pass. with active meaning, or 4th class present: samanu gāhyamāna- Prāt 482.7

gila-ti, swallow (Skt.)
Pres. opt. gile (2 sg.) Ud xxxi.31

guḍāya-ti, thunder, and similar onomat. forms
Pres. guḍāyati (v.l. gud°; subject deva) LV 308.4; pple. guḍuguḍāyamāna- Megh 288.15; gulugulāyanti Mmk 294.12; pple. guluguluyanto Megh 304.19

gumugumunti (! 3 pl.), hum (of lutes; onomat.) Mv iii.267.3; § 28.58

gulugul-, see s.v. *guḍāya-ti*

guh-, see *gūha-ti*

guhm-, semi-MIndic for gumph-, twine (§ 2.35)
Ppp. guhmita-, strung together, RP 47.3; = Skt. gumphita-, cf. Śaur. gumhadu (Sheth)

gūha-ti, and *gūhaya-ti*, wind (garlands); once recorded as *guh-* (cf. Pali Cp. i.9.18 nappaṭiguhāmi, but I suspect a corruption here; meter favors °gūhāmi); on etymology see Dict.
Pres. gūhasi (impv. sense) Mv iii.4.1; gūhayati Mv ii.426.19; impv. guhāhi Mv ii.427.4 (prose; read gūh°?)
Aor. (a)vagūhayet Mv i.304.15

gṛ-, eat, see *gal-*

grath-, twine, wind: *grathnāti* (Skt.), **grathnati*
Caus. grathnāpayati MSV iii.16.5

grah-, take: (1) *gṛhṇa-ti* (sporadic in early Skt.): Pali gaṇhati; n often for ṇ; also **-gṛhṇe-ti* (see under impv., Ger.)
Pres. gṛhṇati Mv ii.242.8; °si Mv iii.169.8; gṛhṇāmaḥ Karmav 52.7; opt. nigṛhṇe, pragṛhṇe Mv i.278.6; °neyā Mv i.347.18; impv. udgṛhṇa Divy 613.25; anugṛhṇāhi Laṅk 4.15; parigṛhṇathā SP 90.10;

pratigṛhṇehi Mv iii.211.10; pple. gṛhṇamāna- Karmav 164.24
Fut. gṛhṇiṣyāmi Mv ii.450.15
Aor. abhinigṛhṇe (1 sg.) Mv ii.124.2; abhigṛhṇiṣu (mss.) Mv ii.307.7
Ger. gṛhṇitvā Mv iii.144.16; °tva SP 113.3; pragṛhṇetvā (§ 35.26) Mv iii.131.4; gṛhṇiyāna Mv ii.452.13
Inf. nigṛhṇitum Mv iii.393.5, 10
Gdve. saṃgṛhṇitavya- Mv ii.479.1
Pass. opt. parigṛhṇīyeya Mv iii.393.13 (mss. °yeyaṃ, °yetaṃ)
Caus. (a) gṛhṇāpayati Mmk 28.9; Ger. °petvā Mv iii.393.19 (§ 38.53)
(b) gṛhṇāveti Mv ii.467.3 (§ 38.69)
(c) *gṛhṇayati, implied by perf. gṛhṇayām āsa Mmk 599.10 (§ 38.9)
(2) *gṛhṇī-te* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. nigṛhṇīyā Mv i.347.18
Fut. gṛhṇīṣyati (§ 31.7) Mv ii.242.2, etc.
Aor. udgṛhṇīṣu SP 181.9 (Kashgar rec.; § 32.37)
Ger. (§ 35.15) gṛhnītvā LV 287.15; 288.7; gṛhṇīya Mv ii.249.14; iii.144.9; gṛhṇīyāna (§ 35.48) Mv ii.241.16; 492.6
(3) **grahe-ti:* Pali *gaheti, Ap. gahei (Sanatk. 629.9; Pres. not recorded here, and only -gahāyati in Pali, cf. Tedesco JAOS 43.389; see § 35.19)
Fut. graheṣyāmi Mv iii.191.17 (prose, v.l. gṛhī°); udgraheṣyanti Vaj. in Hoernle MR 186.8 (§ 31.10)
Aor. agrahe Mv ii.181.20; parigraheṣīd SP 204.8 (§ 32.63); pratyagrahesi Mv ii.38.2 (ib.); pratyagrahetsu Mv i.220.15
Ger. grahāya (§ 35.19) SP 211.6; Divy 327.14 etc.; grahetvā (Senart °tva, m.c.; § 35.25) Mv i.236.6; °tvāna (§ 35.34) Mv iii.5.18; grahiya (§ 35.44) LV 297.3; Mv ii.317.5; upagrahiyāṇa Mv i.227.16; saṃgrahi Śikṣ 340.5
Inf. nigrahetuṃ Mv iii.322.4 (§ 36.8)
Gdve. grahetavya- (§ 34.21) Mmk 79.25; 83.16; 694.10; 708.2
(4) Miscellaneous forms
Fut. pratigṛhīṣyāmi LV 384.3 (§ 31.10)
Aor. -grahīṣī(d) SP 204.8 (? see §§ 32.63, 71)
Ppp. upagrahīta- Mv ii.247.15; § 34.13
Ger. gṛhya (§ 35.9) LV 110.20 etc.; pratigṛhīya LV 240.12; gṛhīya Mv ii.333.22 (? § 35.18)
Inf. udgṛhītum (§ 36.9) Divy 579.21; grahaṇāya LV 338.6
Gdve. nigṛhītavya- Mv i.278.6; saṃgṛhītavya- id. 7 (§ 34.21)
Pass. opt. nigṛhyeya Mv iii.391.17
Caus. opt. grāheya Mv ii.330.18; ppp. pratigrāhita- Mvy 8461

(vi-)ghaṭa-ti, caus. *(vi-)ghāṭaya-ti*, open (Skt. only vighaṭayati; cf. Pali vighāṭita-, AMg. vihāḍiya-)
Caus. ger. vighāṭya Divy 280.9 (§ 38.16)

ghaṭṭa-ti, strike (Skt.)
Aor. saṃghaṭṭetsuḥ Mv i.235.16

ghuṇaghuṇāya-te, buzz (of insects; onomat.); cf. Pkt. ghuṇahuṇiā (noun)
Pres. pple. ghuṇaghuṇāyamāna- (printed °ṇa-) Kv 46.21

ghuṣ-, sound: (1) *ghoṣa-ti* (Skt.)
Caus. Ppp. ghoṣāpita- Mv iii.390.19; ghoṣāpayita-vān (§§ 34.8; 38.57) SP 257.4
(2) Pass. *ghuṣyayate* = Skt. ghuṣyate
Pres. ghuṣyayante (= ghuṣyante) LV 92.6 (§§ 37.21; 38.21)

ghṛ-: *ghara-ti, -te*, drip, flow: Skt. only Gr.; Pali paggharati; cf. *kharati*

Pres. gharati Mv iii.408.1; pragharati Mvy 6967 (v.l. praggh°, so Mironov); Divy 57.21; 409.1; Śikṣ 249.7; Av i.202.13; Karmav 66.4; gharanti Mv i.227.18 (separate from lālā preceding)
Caus. parighareti Mv iii.301.17 (prose; so mss., Senart em. °ghār°; Skt. only -ghār°)

ghṛṣ-, rub, crush: **ghṛṣa-ti*: seems implied by Pkt. oghasiya- (Sheth) = *avaghṛṣita-
Ger. oghṛṣitvā Mv iii.7.4; nighṛṣitvā Mv iii.7.7

ghrā-, smell: (1) *jighra-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. upajighritvā Mv i.353.8; ii.137.8; 139.4
(2) *ghrāya-ti, -te* (not pass.; trans., with object gandha- or the like): Pali ghāyati
Pres. ghrāyati SP 360.5 ff.; 364.4; ghrāyate SP 362.2; 364.1, 2; opt. ghrāyi Śikṣ 341.9; pple. ghrāyanto (n. sg. m.) Mv ii.150.15; 152.9
Fut. ghrāyiṣyi (1 sg. mid., i for e m.c.) LV 222.16
Ppp. ghrāyita- Mv ii.251.10
Ger. ghrāyitvā Mv ii.251.10; 295.12; iii.52.10

(ā-)cakṣa-ti, -te, say, tell (Epic Skt.)
Ppp. ācakṣita- SP 230.8; ācaṣṭa- (§ 34.11) Mv ii.96.17

-caggha-ti, -cagghaya-ti, laugh; cf. Pali (uj-)jagghati
Pres. saṃcagghati Bbh 169.4; uccagghanti Śikṣ 13.1; opt. saṃcagghet Bhīk 28a.3; pple. uccagghantaḥ (n. pl.) Śikṣ 12.15; 49.12; °ghayanto AsP 232.13; uccagghayamāna- AsP 232.18
Fut. uccagghayiṣyati AsP 385.13; 388.19
Ppp. uccagghita-vantaḥ SP 382.12

cama-ti, sip (Skt.)
Aor. ācamesi Mv ii.299.11

car-, move: (1) *cara-ti* (Skt.), also *caraya-ti, care-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. caresi Mv ii.187.23; vicaresi Mv ii.321.21; opt. cari (2 sg., ms.) RP 39.4; ācare (3 sg.) Mv i.12.14; samācareyā Mv iii.373.16; carayesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.42.18; (paricaremha? see § 26.7)
Aor. acari Mv i.3.9; cari Gv 34.18; niścarī LV 179.5; care Mv i.61.15; niścaretsuḥ Mv ii.32.15; acāri (§ 32.18) Ud xxxi.5; anucarittha (§ 32.42) Mv iii.136.15
Ger. caritvāna Mv ii.42.15; ācari Śikṣ 330.3
Pass. pple. paricarīyamāna- Mv ii.423.9
Caus. opt. carāpayeyam SP 53.4
(2) Caus. *cāraya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. pravicāreyyā Mv ii.144.10; impv. paricārehi Mv ii.103.6
Fut. uccāriṣye SP 237.10
Aor. paricāretsu(ḥ) Mv i.194.17 (mss.)
Inf. cāratum Divy 180.13 (§ 36.7)
Pass. cārīyanti Mv iii.176.10

cala-ti, move (Skt.). See also *pracalāya-ti*
Pres. opt. cale LV 335.17; caleya LV 330.3
Aor. cali LV 92.3
Caus. inf. cālanāya Mv ii.329.20

(apa-)cāy-, revere: (1) *-cāya-ti* (Brāhmaṇas and Pali id.)
Pres. apacāyanti Mv ii.259.10; 260.3; opt. apacāyet AsP 57.9
Fut. apacāyiṣyanti Mv iii.424.14
Aor. apacāyesi Mv i.60.1
Ppp. apacāyita- SP 5.8; Mv ii.139.10; Śikṣ 147.11
Ger. apacāyitvā Mv i.44.12 (in same formula Mv iii.138.8 apacayitvā, by misprint or other error)
Gdve. apacāyanīya- AsP 57.2
(2) *-cā-ti* (§ 28.54)

Pres. impv. apacāhi Mv ii.335.12 (so mss.); see Dict. s.v. apacāyati

ci-, gather, note, etc.: (1) *-cina-ti* (for Skt. cinoti): Pali -cinati (and -cināti)
Pres. vicinanti Dbh.g. 11(347).2; 40(66).1; saṃcinanti Dbh.g. 31(57).19; pple. uccinantī Mv ii.452.3, 4 (em.); ācinaṃ (= ācinan) Ud xvii.5 (text unmetr. ācīnaṃ)
Fut. praviciniṣyati SP 372.7
Ger. vicinitvā Mv ii.465.10
(2) *-caya-ti, -ce-ti*, cf. cayate 'V.B.' in Wh. Roots; but see § 28.48; Pali opt. niccheyya Sn 785, implying *niccheti (*niśceti or *niścayati)
Ger. niścayitvā SP 48.6 (uncertain text, see § 35.28 and Dict.; cf. Epic cayitvā, Wh. Roots); saṃciyā (§ 35.44) Dbh.g. 50(76).17; udviciya Mv ii.244.7 (? see Dict.)
(3) *cino-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. 3 pl. upacinontī Śikṣ 4.5; read upacinonti in 4.4 for upacinvanti, as meter proves

(*ā-, abhyā-*)*cikṣa-ti*, tell: Pali (abbh-)ācikkhati, Pkt. (abbh-)āikkhai, see Dict. s.v. ācikṣati
Pres. ācikṣati Mv i.243.6; ii.408.7; °anti ii.132.3; opt. abhyācikṣeyaṃ Mv i.45.1; impv. ācikṣa Mv ii.57.17; 58.15; °āhi iii.192.13
Fut. ācikṣiṣyanti Mv i.272.5; °ṣyaṃ (1 sg.) Mv iii.258.13
Ppp. ācikṣita- Mv i.355.2, 5; abhyā° Mv iii.27.18

ciṭiciṭāya-ti (and variants), crackle, onomat. (of sparks of fire and the like)
Pres. ciṭiciṭāyanti Mmk 298.2; 719.1; ciṭaciṭāyati Mmk 687.9; ciṭiciṭīyanti (read °ciṭāy°?) Mmk 295.6; pple. ciṭiciṭāyamāna- Divy 606.1

citraya-ti, decorate, paint (denom., Skt.)
Caus. gdve. citrāpayitavya- Mmk 61.16

cintaya-ti, think (Skt.)
Pres. opt. anuvicintaye (2 sg.) Laṅk 11.13; cintayi SP 343.13; impv. vicintehi LV 184.2; cintayāhi Mv ii.146.4
Aor. cintayi SP 99.3 (Kashgar rec.)
Ger. cintitva (mss.) SP 117.4; cintayī SP 213.10
Caus. (a) as if *cintayayati: ppp. anuvicintayita-, caused to ponder, SP 109.2 (§ 34.9); see next
(b) cintāpayati: anuvicintāpayamāna-, v.l. Kashgar rec. SP 109.2 (cf. prec.); Fut. cintāpayiṣyāmaḥ SP 271.4

cipya-te (pass.), be crushed: Pali cippiyate or °ti. See also Dict. s.v. naḍa-cippitikam
Pres. pple. cipyamāna- Śikṣ 182.2 (cf. Pali cippiyamāna- Miln. 261.28, 30)

cud-, impel: caus. *codaya-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. codayi LV 169.22

cumba-ti, kiss
Aor. paricumbetsuḥ Mv iii.409.9

culuculāya-ti (onomat.), quiver (? Dict.)
Pres. °yati Mmk 319.11, 15; 324.1

cetaya-ti, buy (see Dict.): cf. Pali caus. cetāpeti, cause to be bought
Ger. cetayitvā Prāt 492.13

cyava-ti, fall (Skt.)
Fut. cyaviṣyati Mv i.196.21
Ger. cyavitvā LV 56.7; °tvāna SP 95.1; °tvana Gv 215.5; cyaviya Mv i.203.4 = ii.6.21

chaḍḍe-ti, abandon; Pali id.
Pres. °ti Mv ii.170.18; iii.291.14

chad: *chādaya-ti*, cover (Skt.), also *chāda-te*
Pres. chādante Sukh 50.16; opt. abhichādaye Mv ii.367.17; chādayeyā SP 228.15; chādayetsuḥ Mv ii.287.2
Aor. chādayi LV 158.19 (3 pl.); āchādesi Mv iii.301.3; āchādaye (1 sg.) Mv iii.249.6
Ger. chāditavya- Mv iii.55.4, chādayitavya- ib. 5, 7, 8, 10

chambha-ti, also *chamba-ti*, be frightened: Pali chambhati, °eti, derived from Skt. skambh-. The spelling chamb- seems recorded only in the Dhvajāgrasūtra, Waldschmidt, Kl. Skt. Texte 4; perhaps only a false recording, but repeated several times
Pres. chambati Dhvaj. (above) 49.23. Only finite form recorded
Ppp. (a-)chambhita- Mv ii.281.15; chambhita-tva- SP 63.5; Gv 159.24; chambita-tva- Dhvaj. 47.6, 16, 24, etc.

chid-, split: (1) *chinda-ti*, and once *chindaya* (impv., non-caus.): Pali id.; based on Skt. 3 pl. chindanti
Pres. chindămi Gv 231.20; chindati LV 200.9; Mv iii.362.10; RP 8.19; Ud x.6 (a later ms. chinatti); samucchindāmaḥ Divy 22.20; chindate Mv i.169.14; opt. chindeya (mss. cha°) Mv ii.125.5; chindetsuḥ Mv iii.258.15, 18; impv. chinda Mv iii.384.16; chindaya (= chinda) Suv 133.8; chindāhi Mv ii.482.16; chindahi Mv iii.140.4; chindatha Suv 61.14
Fut. chindiṣyati Mv ii.145.8; iii.403.18; chindiṣyaṃ Mv ii.173.14 (1 sg., passive)
Aor. chindire (3 sg.) Mmk 366.13 (§ 32.43)
Ppp. chindita- Mmk 708.28
Ger. chinditvā Mv ii.236.3; āchindya Bbh 166.23 (§ 35.13)
Caus. (a) chindayati Mmk 395.14, 18
(b) Fut. chindāpayiṣyāmaḥ Mv iii.403.9
(c) Fut. chedāpayiṣyati Mv iii.403.13 (§ 38.61)
(2) **china-ti*, based on Skt. 3 sg. imperf. acchinat, to which an analogical 2 sg. is authorized (optionally) by Pāṇ. 8.2.75 (Kāś. cites acchinas as an example). While this acchinas has not been noted in Skt. literature, a further analogical creation, acchinam 1 sg., actually occurs in Mbh. (Crit. ed.) 3.22.3. The 'Prakrit Dhammapada' has china = MIndic chinda, Senart JA IX.12 (1898) 248 (and regularly in other cases, ibid. 212); but this may be orthographic for chinna, with nn from nd by phonetic change (so J. Bloch JA 1912, 1, 332, 334). My earlier explanation of the BHS forms (Lang. 13.115) is hereby withdrawn. See § 28.12
? Pres. chinnāmi Divy 417.8 (vs); if not an error, possibly a blend of *chināmi with chindāmi; assimilation of nd to nn, cf. above, has no parallel in our dialect
Aor. chini LV 165.22
Ger. chinitvā LV 195.12; 196.2 (§ 35.28)
(3) **che-ti*: seems implied by the following forms (one of which however is more than doubtful) and by AMg. acche; see § 28.50.
[Pres. impv. 2 pl. ucchethā LV 335.13 (vs), perhaps, destroy! All mss. and both edd. read so (not ucchetthā); followed by hanathā vilumpatha. But Tib. sloṅs, which would render Pali usseti = Skt. ucchrayati, raise (ucchrayate, rise, Vedic), and I incline to take ucchethā as MIndic for ucchrethā, with intransitive meaning, arise!]

Ger. acchetvā Mv iii.285.6, 9 (for ā-ch°, so Senart em., cf. Pali acchindati)
(4) Pass. *chidya-te* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. chidyeya Sukh 45.13

choḍaya-ti (rare), *choraya-ti*, leave, abandon (cf. Skt. chuṭ-, chur-): AMg. choḍiya-, JM. choḍei, Ap. choḍai
Pres. chorayanti LV 321.2; prachoḍayati Kv 58.7, 8, °yāmi 12; impv. chorayantu Divy 353.23
Fut. chorayiṣyāmaḥ Mvy 8595–6; Prāt 534.13
Ppp. chorita- Mvy 2553; Divy 6.6; 82.23; 86.23; 185.28; Kv 57.15, 16
Ger. choḍitvā (v.l. °ḍayitvā) Mv iii.20.2; prachoḍayitvā Kv 55.16; 56.19; choritva SP 251.5; chorayitvā Mv ii.483.3; Divy 166.1; Av i.245.4; Kv 31.24; Mmk 107.27 (text sthor°); choretva Mv ii.391.22; 394.6, 10
Pass. choryate Divy 84.21

jan-, jā-, beget, be born: (1) *jāya-te*, be born (Skt.)
Fut. jāsyante LV 371.22; prajāsyanti LV 398.6 (§ 31.3)
Aor. jāyitha (? 3 pl.) Mv i.10.13; prajāyitha (3 sg.) Mv iii.1.2; ajāyithā (3 sg.) Mv iii.32.16 (on these three see § 32.42); jāye Mv ii.298.16 (so mss.)
(2) *janaya-ti*, beget (Skt.)
Pres. opt. jane (2 sg.) Mv ii.336.7; janaye (3 sg.) Mv ii.295.14; janeyā LV 152.6 (§ 8.36); janeta SP 250.16; impv. saṃjanayāhi Mv ii.134.3; janehi SP 15.12
Aor. jani (2 sg.) LV 91.17; janayi (3 pl., or ger.?) Mv ii.328.6; janayiṣu Mv ii.333.17; janaye Mv i.220.7; jane Mv ii.299.13; janeṣī LV 91.21 (§ 32.63); janayetsuḥ Mv iii.359.9
Ger. janitvā LV 234.7; janayitvāna Mv iii.77.8; saṃjanetvāna Mv ii.205.1; saṃjaniya (or °yā) Mv i.146.9; upajenitvā (! read °jān°? Dict.) LV 36.20
(3) *jānaya-ti* (= Skt. janayati). Not mentioned in Pischel or Geiger. See § 38.15
Pres. saṃjānayati Gv 502.23; opt. jānayi (1 sg.; not to jñā!) Bhad 45; impv. upajānaya Mv ii.135.4
Fut. saṃjānayiṣyanti LV 439.4
Ppp. jānita- Gv 381.17
Ger. jānayitvā Mv ii.131.10; saṃjānayitvā Mv i.238.1 (prose; so mss.; see Dict.); saṃjānayya LV 137.19

**jantaya-ti* or **jante-ti*, impel, make go; denom. to janta- (MIndic for yantra-, see Dict.)
Ppp. jantita- LV 372.15 = Pali yantita-

jalpa-ti, speak (Skt.)
Pres. impv. jalpāhi Mv ii.248.2
Aor. saṃjalpeṣu Mv i.41.8 (§ 32.95)
Caus. (a) *jalpayati (Skt. Gr.): Aor. jalpesi Mv ii.165.3, caused, ordered to say (§§ 32.65, 38.9)
(b) jalpāpayati Mmk 421.21

jāgṛ-, watch: (1) *jāgar-ti* (Skt.). Regular Skt. forms occur (Pres. pratijāgarti Divy 124.9; °rmi Divy 306.12; impv. °gṛhi Av ii.145.2; Fut. °gariṣyāmaḥ Mv iii.323.10). Also:
Aor. pratijāgṛhansuḥ Mv i.231.11, anomalous (see Dict. and § 32.76)
Ppp. pratijāgṛta-, formed regularly but seemingly not recorded in Skt. (which has jāgarita-) Mv i.258.16; ii.111.8; 180.6; iii.324.10; § 34.14
(2) *jāgara-ti* (cited in BR once from Mbh 12); Pali id.; based on
Fut. jāgariṣyati, Ppp. jāgarita-
Pres. pratijāgaranti Mv i.147.11; parijāgaranti Mv i.210.17 = ii.14.16; opt. pratijāgareta (3 sg. mid.) Ud xvi.1; °retha (2 pl.) Mv ii.153.14
Ger. pratijāgaritvā Mv iii.141.15
Inf. pratijāgaritum Av i.257.14
Caus. impv. pratijāgarāpetha Mv ii.156.9; ger. perhaps pratijāgarayetvā (§§ 35.26, 38.9) Mv i.324.8
(3) *jāgra-ti* ('S.E.' in Wh., Roots): Pali jaggati; § 28.11
Pres. opt. pratijāgreta Ud v.15 (see Dict.); impv. pratijāgrāhi Mv ii.274.12 (so Senart em.; mss. °grehi, °grāmi); pratijāgratha (v.l. °gṛthā) Mv ii.150.2
Aor. parijāgriṣu Mv i.76.4; pratijāgraṃsu (v.l. °gṛṣuḥ) Mv i.259.3 (§ 32.76)
Ppp. pratijāgrita- Mv i.270.13; ii.150.8 (both prose); § 34.10

ji-, win: (1) *jaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. jaye (2 sg.) Mv ii.322.7
Fut. parājiṣyāmi (§ 38.31) Mv ii.314.17
Ger. jayitvā Mv i.264.6
Inf. parājayitum Divy 285.20
Caus. jāpayati (Vedic, on MIndic pattern); Pali and BHS, e. g. MSV ii.184.1, read ajāpayan (ms. °yaḥ; ed. em. ahāp° with Pali). Pali shows ms. variation between jāp° and hāp° (PTSD)
(2) *jinā-ti* and *jina-ti*: Pali id. (Vedic jināti, commonly assigned to 'root jyā, jī'; in MIndic entirely equivalent to ji-, jayati; § 28.5
Pres. nirjināti SP 289.3; jināti Mv iii.91.19; parājinanti Mv ii.260.11; 261.11; opt. jineya (1 sg.) Suv 37.9; impv. jinā LV 285.10; jinahi LV 12.19
Fut. saṃnirjiniṣyāmi Mv ii.270.11
Ger. a-jinitvā Mv ii.315.13; abhinirjinitvā Mv i.52.9; jinitvana LV 364.9; jiniyā LV 326.17
(3) *jāya-te* (unparalleled; §§ 28.24, 33, and Dict.)
Pres. jāyate, conquers, LV 262.12, 13 (ā not metrically required)
(4) *jīvati* for *jīyate*, passive (§ 2.31 and Dict.)
Pres. jīvati Mv iii.91.19

jīva-ti, live (Skt.)
Pres. opt. jīve Mv iii.436.4; jīveya Mv ii.184.10
Caus. jīvāpayati Mmk 574.24

ju-: *-java-ti*, hurry, run, chiefly with anu: Pali (anu)-javati; perhaps inheritance from Ved. javate; there is an Epic ppp. prajavita-; no Skt. *javiṣyati or other obvious source of an analogical creation seems recorded
Pres. anujavati Mv ii.212.17; nirjavāmi Gv 434.4; pple. anujavanto Mv ii.217.6
Ger. anujavitvā Mv i.321.6
Inf. anujavitum Gv 400.7

juṣa-ti, enjoy (Skt.)
Inf. juṣitu-kāma- Mvy 6345

jṛ-: *jaraya-ti*, digest (Skt.)
Pres. opt. jareya LV 74.3

jṛmbhe-ti, yawn = Skt. jṛmbhati
Pres. vijṛmbheti Mv ii.281.7 f.
Aor. vijṛmbhesi Mv ii.281.9 ff. (mss.)

jñā- know: (1) *jāna-ti* (Skt. 'U.E.', Wh. Roots): Pali id.
Pres. jānati Bhad 55; °si Mv ii.493.1; saṃjānīte with pass. mg. (§ 37.18) LV 289.4–5; opt. parijāni SP 32.4; jāniyāt (§ 3.39) SP 31.5; jāne (2 sg.) Mv ii.184.8; anujāneyā Mv ii.119.15; anujāneyyā Mv i.351.18; jānesi (2 sg.) Mv i.275.17; jāneyāsi (2 sg.; § 29.37) Mv ii.488.15; impv. (cf. § 28.63) prajānāhi SP 91.7; jānātha LV 314.16
Fut. jāniṣyati Mv i.244.11
Aor. abhijāni (3 pl.) LV 342.3; saṃjāne Mv ii.353.3; saṃjānetsuḥ Mv i.230.3

Ppp. jānita- LV 414.16 (§ 34.10)
Ger. vijānitvā Mv i.192.6; jāniya SP 326.11; vijāniyāna SP 116.1
Inf. jānitum SP 31.10; jānitu Mv iii.34.1 (§ 36.3); vijānanāya LV 420.22
Gdve. jānitavya- Suv 180.10; prajān° Suv 179.5
Pass. anujānīyati Mv iii.176.16
Caus. impv. anujānāpehi Mv i.256.14; Ger. anujānāpetvā Mv ii.174.17

(2) *jānaya-ti*, also (m.c.) *-janeti*, non-caus. = *jānati*
Pres. anujānaye Mv i.257.11; prajānayanti Sukh 9.8; pratijaneti (a m.c.; = °jānāti) Gv 481.22 (vs); opt. parijānayeyā LV 330.17

(3) Caus. *jñāpaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vijñāpema Mv i.360.5; pple. mid. in pass. mg. (§ 37.18) saṃjñāpayamānāḥ Mv i.23.11
Aor. prajñāpayed (1 sg.) Mv iii.53.16
Ppp. prajñāpayita- Mv iii.93.3, 4 (§ 34.8)

(4) Caus. *jñapaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vijñapeyā SP 284.8
Aor. vijñapī Samādh 8.22; prajñapayet Mv i.325.8 (mss.)
Ger. prajñapitvā SP 194.3
Pass. prajñapīyanti Mv ii.274.4

(5) Pass. *jñāya-te* (Skt.)
Aor. prajñāyetsu(ḥ) Mv i.339.2

(6) Miscellaneous forms (on *āṇapeti*, *āṇāpeti*, see s.v.)
Aor. ājñāsi Mv iii.48.19; ajñāsi, Senart em. for mss. anyāsi (§ 2.15) iii.386.18; §§ 32.48, 53
Pass. sannīyate, is known, Karmav 27.27 (§§ 2.15; 37.3 n. 1; Dict.)

jvala-ti, blaze (Skt.)
Pres. opt. jvaleyā Mv iii.317.9
Intens. jājvalanti SP 171.11 (Epic Skt. °lati)

jhāṣaya-ti, destroy: not in MIndic; cf. Dhātup. jhaṣ-, destroy, and Ved. jāsayati id.
Pres. jhāṣayati Śikṣ 59.12; 60.12; 61.2; 89.3

ṭhap-, see *sthā-* (9)

(*uḍ-*)*ḍīya-te*, fly (Skt.), cf. also 2 *lī-*
Inf. uḍḍīyitum Mv ii.243.6

**ḍhala-ti*, dangle: Pkt. (Deśī) ḍhalai (pple. ḍhalanta, Sheth)
Ppp. ḍhalita- LV 371.17
Caus. pple. ḍhālayantaṃ Sādh 569.19; 575.7

takṣa-ti, fashion (Skt.); also *tacch-* (MIndic, § 2.18). Note nistakṣṇuvanti Jm 196.4 (takṣṇuvanti cited only as 'B.S.' in Wh. Roots)
Ppp. takṣita- Mv i.5.8 (Skt. only taṣṭa-); tacchita- Mv i.16.14 (Pali Lex. id., Childers), to Pali tacchati, taccheti
Pass. takṣīyanti (em. Senart) Mv i.16.13, 15

taṅga-ti, stumble (Dhātup.; not in MIndic)
Pres. impv. (in an etymology: mā) taṅga Divy 632.1

tana-ti, extend: vi-t°, see Dict.; cf. Pali ger. vitanitvāna, Pass. vitaniyyati; AMg. Pass. taṇijjae; based on tanoti, § 28.17
Pres. pple. vitanatā MSV ii.156.1 (text vitar°)
Aor. vitane Mv ii.221.20
Ppp. vitanita- MSV ii.159.4 (text vitar°)

tapya-ti, be heated, grieved (Skt.)
Pres. impv. anutapyāhi Mv ii.428.3
Ppp. tapyita- Mv iii.102.13 (so, or tappita-, mss.; Senart em. tapita-)
Gdve. anutapyanīya- Mv iii.74.4

tarja-ti, *tarjaya-ti*, threaten (Skt.)
Aor. tarje (2 sg.) Mv iii.32.5; saṃtarjayetsuḥ Mv iii.194.17

(*pari-*)*tasya-ti*, be exhausted (see Dict.)
Pres. paritasyati Mvy 6813; Bbh 193.6; pple. a-paritasyamāna- Bbh 218.9

tāḍaya-ti, beat (Skt.), also *tāḍa-ti*
Pres. pple. tāḍa LV 341.13 (= tāḍan = tāḍayan), § 38.30

tij-, Caus. *tejaya-ti*, inflame (Skt.)
Aor. samuttejaye (v.l. °yet) Mv i.334.1

tīmaya-ti, make wet (cf. Skt. tim-; timita, wet, Kauṭ. Arth. 2.15, Shamash. p. 95, line 3 from foot); Ap. ppp. tīmia- (Sheth)
Ger. tīmayitvā Divy 285.25

tuṇatuṇāya-ti, onomat., of the sound of the kokila; cf. tuṇa (Dict.); not in MIndic
Pres. °yanti Mv iii.256.2 (v.l. bhuṇabhuṇā°)

tulaya-ti, weigh (Skt.)
Pres. impv. saṃtulehi Mv i.278.19
Ger. tulettā, °tta Suv 36.11 (? § 35.53)

tuṣ-: Caus. *toṣaya-ti*, gratify (Skt.)
Pres. opt. atitoṣaye Mv iii.388.9
Aor. toṣi Śikṣ 346.6

tṛ-, pass; (1) *tara-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. otari (1 sg.) Bhad 29; uttare LV 331.18; impv. otarāhi Mv ii.249.17; otarahi Gv 301.5
Aor. otarī (1 sg.) Gv 256.13; otariṣu Gv 240.18; samuttaretsuḥ Mv ii.125.3
Ppp. tarita- Mv ii.294.9
Ger. taritvā LV 216.10; uttaritvāna Mv iii.301.5; otariya Gv 286.2
Pass. (tarīyati:) otarīyati SP 358.12 (Dict.; to ut-tar-, conquer; ot- for utt-, § 3.73); Fut. tarīhasi Mv iii.328.8, 9 (§ 31.3)

(2) Caus. *tāraya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. tārayeyā LV 300.17; tāreyaṃ Mv i.39.5; impv. saṃtāra RP 49.15; tārehi SP 170.15; saṃtārayahī LV 178.18
Fut. tāriṣye LV 361.4; °ṣyase LV 361.6
Aor. tārayi (3 pl.) SP 51.8; tāresi (1 sg.) Mv iii.77.13
Ger. tāritva SP 149.12; otāriyāna Mv ii.249.13
Caus. ppp. otārāpita- Mv i.273.16

(3) Pass. **-tīra-ti*, MIndic = Skt. tīryate, with nis-, be accomplished
Caus. (*nistīrayati:) Ppp. nistīrita- Dbh 3.20 (§§ 37.28; 38.10)

tṛp-, be gratified: (1) *tṛpya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. tṛpyetsuḥ Mv iii.425.12

(2) Caus. *tarpaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. tarpet SP 126.14; tarpeya SP 351.4; impv. tarpehi SP 190.12
Aor. saṃtarpayi Mv iii.257.10; tarpesi (1 sg.) Mv iii.249.4; saṃtarpayet Mv i.325.11

tyaj-: (1) *tyaja-ti*, abandon (Skt.)
Pres. opt. tyaje Mv i.310.12; impv. parityajāhi Mv i.310.7
Aor. tyaji (2 sg.) LV 165.9
Ger. parityajitvā SP 408.15; tyaji LV 362.7
Inf. tyajitum Mv iii.151.12; Divy 416.26

(2) *tyajya-ti*, nowhere recorded (or pass. with active

ending and mg.? § 37.23)
Imperf. atyajyat Gv 362.18

trapa-te, -ti, be abashed (Skt.)
Ppp. vyapatrapita-vān (not caus.) Av i.272.9
Gdve. apatrapitavya- (not caus.) Bbh 223.12

tras-: (1) *trasa-ti*, be frightened (Skt.)
Pres. impv. trasāhi (em.) Mv ii.462.18
Aor. uttrasiṣuḥ saṃtrasiṣuḥ AsP 17.7 (§ 32.36)
Ppp. an-u(t)traṣṭa- LV 12.16 (§ 2.61)
Gdve. uttrasitavya- Śikṣ 200.14–15
(2) Caus. *trāsaya-ti* (Skt.)
Fut. vitrāsiṣyase LV 334.7

trāya-te (Skt.), *-ti*, save; also MIndic *tāy-*
Pres. impv. trāyāhi Sādh 162.10
Ppp. trāyita- Mv ii.177.4; Gv 301.17
Gdve. paritāyitavya- (MIndic for °trā°) Dbh.g. 3(339).19

daṇḍaya-ti (denom.) punish (Skt.)
Caus. daṇḍāpayati Śikṣ 63.13; 67.10

damaya-ti, subdue (Skt.)
Ger. damiyāna SP 118.4

(vi-)darbhaya-ti (denom.?), intertwine
Pres. opt. vidarbhayet Sādh 532.18; 584.7
Ppp. vidarbhita- Sādh 125.6
Ger. vidarbhya Sādh 357.17

dal-, caus. *dālaya-ti*, cause to burst or split (Skt.)
Pres. opt. dāleya saṃpradāleya Mv ii.125.4; saṃpradāletsuḥ Mv iii.258.15

daś-, bite: (1) *daśa-ti* (Skt.)
Caus. daśāpayati Mmk 462.13
(2) *daṃśa-ti* (once in Skt., pw): Pali ḍaṃsati, AMg. ḍaṃsai
Caus. opt. daṃśāpayet Mmk 463.6

dah-, burn: (1) *daha-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. dahitvā Mv i.8.6
Caus. (a) Pres. opt. dahāpaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.20.8; Ger. dahāpetvā Mv iii.20.9
(b) dāhāpayati Mmk 634.9 (§ 38.61)
(2) Pass. *dahya-te* (Skt.)
Caus. dahyayante LV 242.7 (§ 38.11)

dā-, give: (1) *dada-ti* (Ved. and Epic Skt.): Pali id.; § 28.9. A few regular Skt. present forms are included as examples
Pres. dadāmo LV 368.22; dadanti LV 72.19; opt. daded SP 119.8; dadeya SP 229.4; impv. dada LV 43.1; dadahi LV 78.15; dadāhi (§ 28.61) Mv i.131.3; dadasva SP 321.2
Fut. dadehaṃ? Mv ii.246.11 (§ 31.21)
Aor. ādade Mv ii.157.14
Ger. ādaditvā (so with WT) SP 283.9; daditvāna SP 334.10; dadiya LV 241.7; dadiyāna Mv ii.388.8; dada(t)tvā (? § 35.14) Mv ii.205.6
Inf. dadituṃ LV 288.3
(2) *de-ti*: Pali id.; divergent theories as to origin, Geiger 143; Tedesco, JAOS 43.388; either the latter is right (to ppp. dita-), or these forms are analogical to stheti etc. (root sthā), § 28.48
Pres. demi LV 109.20; Mv i.93.6 etc.; desi Mv ii.428.19; deti LV 384.13; dema Mv i.299.20; denti LV 75.17; Mv i.23.12 (mss.); impv. detu Mv i.349.11; deth(a) LV 123.7; Mv i.46.10; dentu Sādh 2.2

Aor. adetsuḥ Mv iii.305.6 (§ 32.104)
(3) *-daya-ti* (equivalent to *-deti*): § 28.48. But the forms are all dubious; see s.v. *samādayati* (Dict.), for which prob. read always either °*dap*°, caus., or °*diy*°
Pres. samādayanti RP 15.6; pple. samādayanto SP 12.11, Nep. mss. (Kashgar rec. °dapenti, KN em. °dapento, kept by WT without note); dayanto (mss. °nte) Mv i.176.7 (prose; uncertain)
Aor. (? or Ger.) samādayi Śikṣ 337.1, 11
Ger. samādayitvā Śikṣ 304.2, = Mv ii.382.14 where °diyitvā
(4) *dā-ti*: Ap. dāi (Jacobi, Bhav. 205.10); based on aor. adāt, Pali adā. See also *parindāmi*
Pres. dāmi LV 58.20; 59.1, 5; dāsi Mv i.128.18; pradanti (with MIndic short a, § 3.34) Mv i.177.4
Aor. adāsīt (§ 32.55) SP 250.2; adāsi (§ 32.54) Mv i.37.12
(5) Pass. *dīya-te* (Skt.)
Fut. dīyiṣyati Mv i.356.14, 16; dīṣyati Mv i.349.18 etc. (§§ 31.2, 3)
(6) *ā-dīya-ti, -diya-ti*, take (also upā°, paryā°, samā°): Pali ādiyati. Spelling with ī seems not recorded in Pali (but pariyādiyyati occurs, PTSD). See Dict. and § 37.23
Pres. ādīyati Mv iii.447.12; upādīyasi (mss.) Mv i.233.7; upādiyāmi Mv i.233.11; 234.8; samādiyāmi Mv i.145.8 = 202.5 = ii.6.2; opt. ādiyeyaṃ (v.l. ādī°) Mv i.346.10; impv. upādiyāhi Mv i.233.17; ādiyatu Mv iii.217.17; 218.12; pple. ādiyantam (v.l. ādī°) Mv i.346.12; Passive in mg.: paryādīyante KP 5.2, see Dict.
Aor. ādiyeya Mv i.346.11 (mss. °yaṃ or ādīyeya; 3 sg.), § 32.105
Ppp. -ādinna-, see below
Ger. samādiyitvā Mv i.128.9; ii.382.14; upādiyitvā (em.) Mv i.89.17
(7) Caus. *-dāpaya-ti* (Skt.); also as non-caus. = *-diyati*, see § 32.58
Aor. samādāpaye Mv i.321.18
(8) Caus. *-dape-ti*: Pali id. (§ 38.52)
Pres. samādapetī (with all mss.) SP 23.6; °pemī SP 323.9; °pemo SP 56.4; pple. °pento SP 64.7
Aor. samādapinsu SP 51.8 (so with Kashgar rec.)
(9) Miscellaneous forms
Pres. opt. dadyā Mv i.80.6; dadyatha (mss.) Mv ii.105.3 (§ 29.43)
[Fut.? dadyehaṃ Mv ii.73.17, prob. corrupt; § 31.21]
Ppp. dinna- (= Pali id.) Mv i.44.13, and often; § 34.16; KP 9.13; Mmk 56.21; samādinna- (to -ādīyati, above) Mv i.211.14 = ii.15.14; paryādinna- (to -ādīyati) Mv iii.429.11, 15
Inf. paryādatuṃ and °dattuṃ KP 33.2 and 3 (§ 36.12)

diś- point, indicate: (1) *diśa-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. nirdiśeya SP 284.1
Preterite diśa (= adiśat) LV 391.21 (§ 32.115)
Ger. saṃdiśitvā Mv i.354.14
Inf. vyavadiśituṃ Mv iii.50.8
Gdve. ādiśitavya- Mv iii.420.11
Pass. nirdiśyati Samādh p. 23 line 1
(2) *-diśya-ti* (not recorded)
Pres. pple. uddiśyadbhir Divy 191.3 (Dict.)
(3) *-deśa-te* (not recorded; denom.?) See also under (4)
Pres. pple. vyapadeśamāna- Prāt 525.9, making representations, speaking; perh. denom., to vyapadeśa
(4) Caus. *deśaya-ti* (Skt.), also as non-caus., § 38.23, and also *deśa-ti, -te* as caus.
Pres. deśati Suv 19.4; deśate Mv i.187.3; impv. deśantu Suv 23.8.—opt. deśaya (? 1 sg.; § 29.35) Mv i.43.3; deśayi (1 sg.) Suv 51.14; deśeta SP 282.6; deśeyam Mv i.37.8; 60.6; deśeya LV 393.2; impv. deśehi Mv iii.124.14; deśayahī LV 175.2—In non-caus. mg., uddeśenti, they point out, Mv i.21.3; 23.9

Aor. deśayet Gv 146.3 (§ 32.87); deśayuḥ or °yī (§§ 32.118, 121) SP 272.10

(5) Miscellaneous

Inf. nirdiṣṭum (§ 36.9) Mmk 4.18

dīpaya-ti (caus.), light, trans. (Skt.)

Caus. pple. pradīpāpita- Mv iii.177.8

duḥkha-ti (denom.), be painful: Pali dukkhati

Pres. duḥkhati SP 352.7; duḥkhanti SP 100.12

Caus. duḥkhāpayasi Mv i.179.19

duṣ-, *dūṣ-*: (1) *dūṣaya-ti*, defile (Skt.)

Aor. dūṣayetsuḥ Mv i.342.12

(2) *duṣya-ti*, *-te*, *dūṣya-te*, become malicious or hateful (Dict.; this mg. acquired through association with doṣa, hatred = Pali dosa, Skt. dveṣa)

Pres. duṣyati KP 97.4; dūṣyate MadhK 457.4; opt. duṣyeta MadhK 143.1

dṛ-, split: Pass. *dīrya-te* (Skt.), see § 34.10

Ppp. dīrita- Mmk 143.24 (§ 37.28)

dṛś-, see: (1) *dṛśa-ti*, and MIndic *daś-*, chiefly in pret. forms: based on Pali addasa etc. = Ved. aor. adṛśat (dd by contamination with Pali addakkhi = Skt. adrākṣīt); §§ 28.12; 32.25

Pres. dṛśanti Dbh.g. 8(344).16; opt. dṛśema, or with v.l. indic. dṛśāma, Mv iii.427.6; opt. dṛśi Śikṣ 341.5

Aor. addaśā (§ 32.111) Mv i.9.3; addaśi, addṛśi (§ 32.25) LV 194.12, 22 (mss. d for dd); Mv ii.37.9 etc.; dṛśi LV 230.4; dṛśī LV 194.13; addaśāsi (§ 32.57) Mv i.237.7; a(d)dṛśāsi (3 sg.) LV 196.12 etc.; (2 sg.) LV 195.11; addaśāmi (§ 32.58) Mv i.318.1; a(d)dṛśāti (ib.) LV 75.6 etc.; addaśensuḥ Mv ii.344.19; °śetsuḥ (§ 32.103) Mv ii.312.7; adṛśetsuḥ Mv iii.409.13; adṛśetsu, addaśetsu Mv i.328.5, 6; adṛsu (for °śu) LV 27.22 (§ 32.118)

(2) *darśa-ti*, *-te*; see § 32.27

Pres.(?) darśe LV 222.15; if correct, 1 sg. pres. mid. with fut. mg.; but some mss. drakṣe, intending drakṣye, fut.

Aor. vidarśi LV 49.10 (3 pl.); a(d)darśi, °śī, darśi (§ 32.27) Mv i.303.15 etc.; addarśā (§ 32.111) Mv ii.186.8, 14

Inf. darśanāya SP 425.2; 431.2 etc.; darśanāye Mv iii.366.20

(3) Pret. *-drakṣi*; may be semi-MIndic for Skt. adrākṣīt (or semi-Skt. for Pali ad(d)akkhi); or more likely a new aor. to Pres. *drakṣati = Pali dakkhati, §§ 28.41; 32.26; Geiger 136.3 (who bases it on the fut., cf. śakṣati, root śak; but cf. also aor. Pali addakkhi); anudrakṣi Mv ii.54.3

(4) Pass. *dṛśya-te* (Skt.)

Pres. active (§ 37.10 n. 2), dṛśyanti Laṅk 268.14 (vs), they see, and saṃdṛśyati, sees, Gv 523.21 (based on pass.; Dict.); passive, opt. dṛśye Mv iii.10.16

Aor. dṛśyiṣu LV 74.12; dṛśyetsu(ḥ) Mv iii.94.15

(5) Caus. *darśaya-ti* (Skt.)

Pres. opt. darśeya LV 284.5; darśaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.2.17; upadarśayesi SP 98.8; impv. upadarśehi Mv ii.426.10; pradarśayāhi SP 178.11 (Kashgar rec.)

Fut. darśiṣye SP 237.9

Aor. darśayi SP 49.7 (3 pl.); °yīm (§ 32.39) SP 90.3; darśi Gv 254.25; darśinsu SP 55.12; darśaye Mv i.297.14; darśetsu Mv i.192.15

Ger. vidarśiya Śikṣ 329.3; darśayi Śikṣ 328.17; Gv 240.26; 253.15; nidarśayi Śikṣ 330.8; 333.17; vidarśayi Śikṣ 333.17

Pass. darśiyati LV 184.3, 4.—Uncertain is darśyanti LV 222.4 (vs); perh. for Skt. °te, are shown; but Tib. 'Śakra and Brahma show (ston, as if darśayanti!) ... saying, This is the way.' Ms. A dṛśyanti, are seen. Cf. § 28.26

(6) Miscellaneous

Fut. dṛkṣye RP 46.10 (§ 31.25)

Gdve. a-dekṣiya- and a-drākṣaṇīya-(?), see Dict.

(pari-)deva-ti, mourn (Skt.)

Aor. parideve Mv ii.33.8; paridevetsuḥ Mv ii.217.11

Ger. paridevitvā Mv ii.189.15

dru, run: dravati (Skt.)

Inf. abhidravitum MSV ii.34.4 (prose)

**druha-ti*, be hostile: Skt. aor. (a)druhat; AMg. duhati (Ratnach.), duhai (Sheth, Addenda, iv.1263)

Aor. druhi LV 165.18 (less likely ger.)

**(ava-)dvāraya-ti*, close a door (denom.)

Caus. Ger. avadvārāpayitvā Mv ii.490.1

(vi-)dveṣa-te, hate: Pali viddesate (read so in Therīg. 418, most mss. vindesate; Sdhp. 82 viddesanīya-); prob. denom. from vidveṣa = Pali viddesa

Pres. pple. vidveṣamāṇa- SP 94.8

dhandhāya-ti, *-te* (denom.), be slow, be dull: cf. Pali dandha-, adj. Usually spelled dhanv- (Dict.)

Pres. dhandhāyati AsP 284.4; 326.4; pple. a-dhandhāyamāna- Bbh 284.7

Fut. dhandhāyiṣyati AsP 176.9

Ppp. dhandhāyita-tva, -tā AsP 31.16; 454.9, 11; Gv 451.7

dhama-ti, blow (Skt.), also *dhamaya-ti*, non-caus.

Pres. opt. vidhamaye (2 sg.) LV 117.6; vidhameyā Mv ii.404.7

Special form of ppp. nirdhānta = Pali niddhanta; prob. also Pass. nirdhāyate, °ti, pres. pple. °yantāni; see Dict. s.vv.; §§ 34.11; 37.38

dhā-, place: (1) *dadhā-ti* (Skt.); non-Skt. forms on the strong redupl. stem, as in MIndic, e. g. Pali gdve. saddahātabba- DN ii.346.22; § 28.52

Pres. impv. śraddadhādhvam SP 44.3 (prose, both edd., no v.l.); § 28.61

Fut. (§ 31.8) abhiśraddadhāsyasi Divy 7.29; °sye id. 8.1; śraddadhāsyanti SP 38.3, 5 (vss; in corresponding prose śraddhāsyanti), and Kashgar rec. at SP 231.4 (prose, text with 2 Nep. mss. śraddadhiṣyanti); abhiśraddadhāsyanti Divy 14.24; Kv 23.14

Ppp. abhiśraddadhāta- Divy 16.5 (§ 34.11)

Inf. śraddadhātum Divy 6.21 (§ 36.11)

Gdve. a-śraddadhānīya- (§ 34.22), acc. to Kern, Preface, vii, is read somewhere in SP by Kashgar rec. for Nep. a-śraddheya-; duḥ-śraddadheya SP 70.2 (vs; reading not certain; § 34.24)

(2) *dadha-ti*, *-te* (§ 28.9; such forms occur in RV and later, esp. in Epic; in MIndic they, or daha-, are regular)

Pres. (a few samples; very common) abhiśraddadhasi Divy 538.3; śraddadhanti LV 89.21; 393.6; opt. śraddadhed SP 255.2; abhiśraddadheta SP 93.4; impv. avadadhata LV 409.10; pple. a-śraddadhantā(ḥ) SP 95.6

Fut. śraddadhiṣyanti SP 313.5; abhiśraddadhiṣyanti Mv iii.76.9

Aor. śraddadhī and °dhīt (§ 32.45) SP 113.10; samādadhi Mv ii.204.11 (vs; so read with one ms.)

Ger. abhiśraddadhitvā SP 80.5

Inf. śraddadhitum Mv i.185.11

Gdve. abhiśraddadhitavya- Mv iii.76.6; a-śraddadhanīya- SP 230.7 (prose)

Pass. pple. anu-dadhyamāna- (?), see Dict. and § 37.37

(3) **daha-ti*: Pali id.; = prec. with MIndic h for dh (§ 2.35)

Ger. dahitvā Mv ii.377.6; °tva id. 379.7; °tvāna id. 365.6; nidahiya Mv ii.320.16 (Senart em. nidahya)

Caus. saṃnidāhayanti MSV iv.87.8 (Dict.)

(4) *-dhā-ti*: AMg. and other Pkt. dhāi (apparently not in Pali); based on Skt. aor. adhāt (?with fut. dhāsyati, inf. dhātum); § 28.51

Pres. antardhāmi Gv 70.9; upanidhāti Ud ix.6 (reading not certain but probable); śraddhāti SP 336.2

Ppp. śraddhāta- Mv i.187.6 (mss.), see § 34.11 and Dict. s.v. sadyaṃ

(5) *-dha-te*: AMg. -dhai (Pischel 500), -dhati, dhae (Ratnach. iv.654); analogical to -dhāmi (above, 4) on pattern bhavāmi : bhavate etc.; § 28.10

Pres. sa na śraddhate Divy 279.12 (prose)

(6) *-dhe-ti*: Pali id., AMg. -dhei; acc. to Geiger 142.2 based on impv. dhehi; in some cpds. occurs ppp. -dhita, from which this might easily be a back-formation; spellings are found with i for e, usually m.c. but sometimes, perhaps, as in MIndic for ĕ in closed syllable; § 28.48

Pres. apidheti Mv ii.493.8; pidheti Mv ii.493.17; praṇidheti Mv i.83.8; °dhenti Mv i.120.5; paṭisaṃdheti Mv iii.65.9, °dhenti 12, pratisaṃdheti 14; praṇidhisi (2 sg., i m.c.; § 3.48) Gv 57.15, 20; pple. praṇidhintāna (mss.; gen. pl.; § 3.49) Mv i.124.18

Fut. saṃvidheṣyanti Mv i.354.12

Aor. praṇidhesi Mv i.42.6; anupraṇidhesi Mv i.335.11; § 32.64

Ppp. pidhita- Śikṣ 81.1 (cf. pithita s.v. *pithayati*); antardhita- Gv 444.13; saṃdhita- Mv ii.222.7 (mss.), 17; § 34.7

Ger. praṇidhitvā Mv i.96.10 (or to 5 above), § 35.28

Inf. saṃdhituṃ Mv iii.390.6 (or to 5)

(7) *-dhaya-ti, -te*: § 28.48; cf. -dheti (above, 6); most of the forms recorded belong to śrad-dhā, and might be regarded as denom. to the noun śraddhā

Pres. abhiśraddhayanti Suv 192.8 (prose; v.l. °dadhanti); śraddhayate, and pple. śraddhayamāna- Śikṣ 2.16

Ppp. śraddhayita- Divy 437.1 (prose)

Ger. pidhayitvā Mmk 566.21, having closed (a door or gate); cf. pidhāyitvā (8, below) just above in 18. One of these may be an error of tradition for the other

(8) *-dhāya-ti, -te*; chiefly in comp. with antara-, intrans., disappear; prob. based on old Skt. aor. pass. antar-adhāyi (this is a common form in Pali), 'was concealed', then, 'disappeared', which was reinterpreted in MIndic as antara-dhāyi, hence pres. antara-dhāyati (i being the regular MIndic aorist ending to stems in a); § 28.22. For this antara-hāyati is usually substituted in our language (9 below). The isolated pidhāyitvā is suspicious (below). In Pali cf. ppp. saddhāyita-, 'believed', Pv ii.8.5 (glossed in comm. 109.10 saddhāyitabba, 'credible'); this may be a denom. from saddhā, cf. (7) above

Aor. antaradhāyiṣuḥ (most mss. °ṣu; § 32.30) LV 397.21–22

Ppp. antarahita-, see under -hāyati (9)

Ger. pidhāyitvā Mmk 566.18, see under (7)

(9) *-hāya-ti*, chiefly with antara-; = -dhāyati (8); § 2.35; once also pari-hāpita-. Not recorded in Pali or Pkt. except in ppp. antara-hita (cf. Skt. hita). Once antar-hā°; antara-hā° is much commoner in BHS than °dhā°

Pres. antarahāyati Mv iii.410.12; °te Mv i.175.9 (mss.); impv. °tu Mv iii.346.21

Aor. antarahāyi (= antar-adhāyi, see under 8) Mv ii.256.11; °hāye Mv i.339.18; 340.11; °hāyithā (v.l. °tha; 3 sg.; § 32.42) Mv ii.240.17; °hāyetsuḥ Mv i.231.2 (so one ms.); ii.258.3; 259.2; iii.93.2; °hāyiṣu Suv 158.1; °hāyasi (§ 32.62) Mv iii.316.10

Ppp. antarahāyita- (v.l. antarh°) Mv iii.424.16; antarahita- (= Skt. antarhita-) Mv i.50.14 etc.; Gv 325.16

Inf. antarahāyitum Mv ii.97.10, 20

Pass. pple. antarahīyanto Mv ii.178.3 (mss. °nti, °ntī)

Caus. impv. antarahāpaya (em.?) Mv i.75.14; Fut. antarahāpayiṣyanti RP 17.15; Ppp. parihāpita- Mv ii.170.12; Ger. antarhāpayitvā Divy 329.12; in Mv iii.6.9 prob. read antarahāpayitvā (mss. °hāyatvā, Senart °hāyitvā, but trans. mg., having made to disappear)

(10) **-dhiha-ti*; nowhere recorded; analogous to sthihati from *sthā-*, q.v.; § 28.44

Aor. 3 sg. saṃdhihe Mv ii.221.20 (Senart em. saṃdahe)

(11) Miscellaneous

samādhyate Laṅk 24.17; 33.8; 203.13 (denom. to samādhi? § 37.34; or false Sktization of Pali passive samādhiyate?)

dhāva-ti, run (Skt.)

Pres. impv. nirdhāvāhi Mv ii.454.20

Aor. pradhāvitsuḥ Mv i.220.19; saṃdhāvetsuḥ Mv i.347.16

Ger. saṃdhāvitvāna Mv i.55.8; 56.14 (by Senart's plausible em.); nirdhāviya Mv ii.31.15; *nirdhāviyāna* Mv ii.471.19; 475.6

dhu-, dhū-, shake: (1) *dhuna-ti*: Pali id.; based on Skt. dhunoti, rarely dhunāti; §§ 28.15, 17

Pres. impv. dhuna LV 285.10 (read dhunā m.c.); vidhunāhi Sādh 4.16; pple. nidhunantaḥ RP 29.1

Fut. vidhuneṣyase LV 333.12 (passive; to 'Caus.', 3 below? but v.l. vidhuniṣyase, which perhaps read); vidhuniṣyasi (v.l. vidhū°) Mv ii.307.15

Ppp. vidhūna- Mvy 6983 (see § 34.18 and Dict.)

Ger. apadhunitvā Mv i.321.6; vidhuniya Sukh 23.8

(2) Pass. *dhūya-te* (Skt.)

Aor. saṃdhūyetsuḥ Mv ii.162.5 (mss. °dhūpetsuḥ, °dhup°)

(3) 'Caus.' *dhūnaya-ti* (Skt.; in mg. = simplex); perh. also *vidhunayati* implied by vidhuneṣyase, above?

Ger. vidhūnitvā Mv ii.315.8

dhūpaya-ti (denom.), perfume (Skt.)

Pres. opt. dhūpeya Mv ii.373.17

dhṛ-, hold: (1) *dhāraya-ti* (Skt.)

Pres. opt. dhāre SP 255.10; 293.8; dhāraye SP 98.12; dhāreta (§ 38.27) SP 255.14; dhāreya SP 229.6; dhārayi SP 393.8; impv. dhārehi SP 209.7

Aor. dhārayi Mv i.235.6; °yiṣu SP 181.9 (Kashgar rec.); dhāresi Mv i.265.15; ii.234.10; dhārayesi Mv ii.233.9; dhāraye (mss.; 3 pl.) Mv ii.21.6; dhārayetsuḥ Mv i.220.14 (? so mss.); dhāretsuḥ Mv i.265.1

Pass. dhārīyāmi Mv ii.489.15 (v.l. dhāri°)

Caus. impv. dhārāpayehi (so with mss.) Mv ii.447.14 (§ 38.20); Aor. dhārāpayet Mv ii.117.5

(2) *dhara-ti*, also *dhare-ti*, non-caus.: Pali dharati; § 28.13

Pres. opt. abhyuddhareyā Mv ii.393.8; pple. dharanto (gen. sg.) LV 191.7.—indic. 2 sg. dharesi Mv i.210.1 = ii.13.21 (prose; in reply to this, in vs, i.210.3 = ii.14.2 dhāremi); i.210.9 = ii.14.8 (vs)

Aor. dharasi (v.l. °sī; § 32.62) Mv ii.356.9

Inf. dharituṃ LV 29.9

dhṛṣ-, violate

Inf. dharṣaṇāye Mv ii.320.8

dhova-ti, wash, MIndic: Pali id.; once *dhop-*; related to Skt. dhāv- (o influenced by ppp. Pali dhota-, Geiger 34; less plausibly Pischel 482)

Pres. dhovati Mv ii.466.7; Śikṣ 155.1; dhovāmi Mv

ii.244.15; Śikṣ 154.18 (text dhop°, perhaps to be kept, see Dict.); Jm (App.) 241.1; dhovanti Mv i.168.12; impv. dhovāhi Mv ii.430.3; dhova Śikṣ 154.20; dhovatu Śikṣ 154.19
Fut. dhoviṣyati Mv iii.312.17; dhoviṣyaṃ Śikṣ 154.19–20
Ppp. su-dhovita- Mv ii.466.9; saṃdhovita- Mmk 60.7 (see Dict.); also paridhauta- (cf. Skt. dhauta-) Mv iii.144.11 (Dict.)
Ger. dhovitvā Mv ii.244.13; iii.313.7
Inf. dhovitu-kāma- Mv iii.312.15
Pass. dhovīyanti Mv ii.466.4, 5

1 *dhyā-*, meditate: (1) *dhyāya-ti, -te* (Skt.); once *-dhyeti* (MIndic contraction?)
Pres. praṇidhyenti Gv 371.24 (Dict.)
Fut. dhyāyiṣyase LV 334.21
Aor. dhyāyī SP 23.12; dhyāyi LV 133.21; pradhyāye Mv ii.283.3
Ger. dhyāyitvā LV 164.9; dhyāyī LV 116.10
Inf. avadhyāyitum Divy 494.8; Av ii.139.8
Caus. nidhyāpayanti LV 187.19 (Pali nijjhāpeti; Skt. dhyāpayati only Gr.); dhyāpayati Mv iii.388.9 (? v.l. dhyāyeti; text doubtful); Ppp. nidhyapta- Śikṣ 130.13 (= Pali nijjhatta-, Dict.), § 38.52
(2) *-dhyā-ti* (Skt.), or *-dhya-ti*? § 28.10
Pres. pple. avadhyanto (v.l. °tā) Mv i.9.4, musing upon, with acc.; so mss.; Senart em. āvajjanto. The form may, however, belong in § 3.34

2 *dhyā-*, burn: *dhyāya-ti*, false hyper-Skt. = Pali jhāyati (intrans., burn, be on fire), caus. jhāpeti (trans., burn). Here mostly trans., even when (in the mss.) containing no -p- (such forms should perhaps be emended by reading -p- for -y-, as caus.)
Pres. abhidhyāyati Mv iii.341.6, was aflame, intrans. (see Dict.)
Ppp. dhyāyita- Mv ii.78.15; 174.11, burned, cremated (read dhyāpita- ?)
Ger. dhyāyetvā Mv i.302.12; 304.12 (mss.; Senart °tvāna) having burned, cremated (read dhyāpetvā ?)
Caus. Ppp. dhyāpita-, cremated, Mv i.357.17; RP 57.2; Pass. pres. pple. dhyāpiyantānāṃ (so Senart for mss. dhyāniy°) Mv i.126.2

(*ud*)-*dhvasya-te*, be insulted, pass. of *ud-dhvaṃs-*; cf. Pali uddhaṃsati, AMg. uddhaṃsei, insult; § 38.13
Pres. pple. uddhvasyamāna-, so read for text udvaśya° Śikṣ 57.8
Caus. ger. uddhvasyāpayitvā, so read for text udvaśyā° Śikṣ 57.6, having caused to be insulted

nad-, sound: (1) *nada-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. anunade Mv ii.282.12
Fut. saṃpranadahe (? 1 sg.; § 31.20) LV 338.19
Aor. nadi (1 sg.) Sukh 24.2; nadinsu Hoernle MR 152 for SP 271.2; anunade Mv ii.282.10; ninadetsuḥ Mv i.71.7 (so read)
Ger. naditvā Mv iii.410.17; °tvāna Mv iii.24.3; nadiya Mv i.206.5
Inf. naditu LV 46.6
(2) *-*nadya-ti*, nowhere recorded
Aor. praṇadyetsuḥ Mv ii.160.19

nanda-ti, rejoice (Skt.)
Pres. opt. abhinandeyā Mv iii.387.18 (Senart em. °ya); impv. nandāhi Mv ii.187.9
Aor. abhinandi Mv ii.226.10; nandiṣu LV 76.2; ninandiṃsuḥ (v.l. °tsuḥ) Mv iii.267.8; abhyanande (3 pl.) Mv ii.139.22; abhinandetsuḥ Mv i.335.7
Ger. abhinanditvā Mv ii.443.17; abhinandiya Mv i.149.18
[Caus. aor.: in Mv ii.62.11 probably abhinandayet or °ye is false reading for abhinādaye(t), made resound; cf. corresponding Pali Jāt. v.409.4 abhinādayittha]

nam-, bend, bow: (1) *nama-ti* (Skt.), also *namaya-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. namayati LV 398.1; opt. saṃname (1 sg.) Mv ii.93.9; name (3 sg.) Mv ii.395.11
Aor. onamī (3 pl.) LV 356.19; namiṣu LV 92.8; onamiṣṭa LV 295.7 (§ 32.46); name Mv i.322.20
Ger. onamitvā Mv iii.98.9; praṇamayya Av i.347.4; ii.3.9; Divy 463.22 (?)
Gdve. saṃnamitavya- Mv ii.230.15; avanamitavya- Gv 507.1
(2) *-nāma-ti*, nowhere recorded: denom.? or modelled on pairs of equivalent presents such as kramati and krāmati? § 28.33. Or to §§ 38.23 and 27? Cf. (3) below
Pres. opt. pariṇāmet, would be digested, LV 64.20 (prose; all mss. reported with ā, only Calc. a); cf. pariṇāma-, noun (?)
(3) Caus. *nāmaya-ti* (Skt.), and rarely *nāma-ti* (§ 38.28); once nam-, probably m.c.; on pariṇāmayati (sometimes intrans., may be denom., or to § 38.23) see Dict. and (2) above
Pres. nāmanti Śikṣ 324.18; upanāmemi Mv iii.135.13; opt. nāmaye Mv ii.367.13; impv. upanāmehi Mv iii.352.6
Aor. praṇāmi Mv iii.147.19; nāmayī LV 74.2; upanāmayi Mv ii.38.12; praṇāmaye Mv i.303.14; nirṇāmesi Mv i.228.12; abhinirnāmayesi Mv ii.284.7; abhināmayet Mv i.325.8; abhiprāṇamayetsuḥ Mv i.65.18 (probably m.c. for °ṇām°)
Ppp. upanāmayita- Mv ii.168.6 (§ 34.8)
Ger. praṇāmetvā Mv i.255.12; °tvāna Mv iii.97.14 (by em.)
Inf. saṃnāmanāya Divy 446.20
Pass. upanāmīyanti (v.l. °miy°) Mv ii.465.10; upanāmiyanti Mv ii.463.10; 464.9 (here v.l. °mīy°); opt. (read with best mss.) upanāmye 'yaṃ LV 386.17

namasya-ti (denom., Skt.) and *namasyaya-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. namasyayanti LV 119.2
Aor. namasyi (mss.) Mv ii.298.10

naś-, perish: (1) *naśya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. praṇaśyire Mmk 172.13 (§ 32.43)
(2) Miscellaneous
Aor. pranaṅkṣīt AsP 112.17 (§ 32.83); cf. Skt. fut. naṅkṣyati

nah-, bind: (1) *-naha-ti*; not recorded, unless implied by Pali ger. saṃnahitvā (beside saṃnayhitvā) Jāt. i.273.23
Pres. onahatī, or (v.l.) °te SP 126.2
Aor. paryavanahe Mv i.346.2
Ger. saṃnahitvā (= Pali, above) Mv i.30.6, 7; ii.410.3
(2) Miscellaneous
Fut. saṃnatsyāmi Śikṣ 283.4 (natsyate Skt. Gr.); § 31.23

ninda-ti, reproach (Skt.)
Pres. impv. nindāhi Mv ii.448.4

nipacchita, see *nepatthita*

nī-, lead: (1) *naya-ti* (Skt.), *ne-ti*: Pali both
Pres. opt. vineyaṃ Mv i.337.8; vineya Mv i.43.4; apanaye Mv ii.393.13; impv. vyapanehi SP 15.12; ānayāhi Mv ii.170.6
Aor. upanayi (1 sg.) Sukh 23.10; upanaye Mv ii.299.12; nayetsuḥ Mv i.346.6; upanayāsi Mv iii.429.14 (§ 32.59); vinesi Mv i.297.13 etc. (§ 32.63); vinayesi Mv iii.428.10

Ppp. samudānita- SP 178.13; LV 414.16 (§§ 3.43, 34.7, 38.3); cf. samudānana, Dict.
Ger. apanayitvā SP 106.4; netvā (§ 35.25) Mv ii.168.8; samudānayitvanā LV 178.15; samudāniya (§§ 3.43, 38.3) LV 394.17; apaniya (§ 35.44) Sukh 23.9; upanayi LV 116.10
Caus. Fut. ānāpayiṣyaṃ Mv iii.125.17; °peṣyaṃ Mv ii.103.5; Ppp. ānāpita- Mv ii.76.4
(2) *nī-te*, act. or pass. in meaning; § 24.12
Pres. samudānīmahe Divy 92.9 (prose), we assemble or procure (merchandise). Could be taken as indic. or opt. Hardly to be connected with Vedic forms like ánītām. In line 12 same expression with samudānayanti, 3 pl. Prob. analogical to ppp. nīta- on some such pattern as adhīta- : adhīte, or more remotely yāta- : yāti etc.
Fut. nīṣyati, pass., will be taken, Mv ii.110.1 (§ 31.3)
Gdve. a-vinīya-, not to be disciplined (if not error for avineya or avinīta), MSV iii.128.20; § 34.27
(3) Caus. *nāyaya-te* (Skt.), in non-caus. mg. (§ 38.23)
Fut. apanāyayiṣyase LV 365.3, you will dispel

nuda-ti, impel (Skt.)
Aor. praṇude Mv iii.286.7
(Caus. nodayati:) Aor. vinodaye (2 sg.) Mv ii.186.20; vinodetsu Mv i.250.10. In non-caus. mg., prativinodayati, dispel (§ 38.23), see Dict.

nepatthita-, *nepacchita-*, or the like, clothed; perhaps read *nev-* (MIndic, § 2.30); ppp. of denom. from Skt. nepathya-, raiment, see Lüders, Kl. Skt. Texte ii.44
Ppp. nipacchita-, Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā (Lüders l.c.); corruptly Divy 48.24; 49.16; 159.12; 342.2; 463.26; 558.22; text naiva sthita-, nopasthita-, or te panthita-; Av i.284.11; 347.9, ms. neva sthita-, nepathyasthita-

paṃsaya-ti, -te, besmirch (Skt. Gr.): AMg. *paṃsei*
Pres. paṃsayati Śikṣ 158.3; Bbh 107.10; 174.21; prati-p° KP 107.3; paṃsayanti Śikṣ 62.3; 63.6; 90.14, 16; °yate KP 107.24; opt. °yema Śikṣ 98.17; °yeyur 186.6
Ppp. paṃsita- KP 107.2, 4; °ta-vant- Śikṣ 68.16

[*pakṣa-ti*, adhere to (a party), denom. (Skt. Gr.; nowhere else recorded)
Pres. pakṣanti LV 88.15; prob. error, see Dict.]

pac-, cook: (1) *paca-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. pacitvā Mv ii.65.9
(2) Pass. *pacya-te* (Skt.), MIndic *pacca-*
Pres. pple. paccamāna- (v.l. ya°) Mv iii.45.14; saṃpaccamāna- (mss. saṃya°) Mv iii.43.3
Fut. paripaccisyati Mv ii.311.8 (pass.)
(3) Caus. *pācaya-ti* (Skt.), also *pāca-ti*
Pres. paripācati Śikṣ 325.2 (§ 38.28)
Aor. paripācayī SP 204.13
Ger. prapācayitvā Gv 411.20
(4) Miscellaneous
Ppp. pakva-māna-, being baked, Divy 510.8 (§ 34.1)

(*paṭa-ti*,) *pāṭaya-ti*, tear (Skt.)
Ppp. paṭita- Mv i.5.8 (§ 38.9)
Ger. pāṭitva SP 85.12; [utpāṭayitu? § 35.55]
Pass. Ger. utpāṭya, being torn up, LV 194.10 (contrast utpāṭya, tearing out, Divy 417.6), § 35.17

pat-, fly, fall: (1) *pata-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. praṇipati (1 sg. mid.) LV 361.19; opt. prapate Mv ii.334.12; pateyā Mv ii.324.21; impv. samnipatitha Mv i.329.17 (§ 27.10)
Perfect papeture Mmk 593.18 (§ 33.5)
Aor. nipatī LV 282.3; prapatiṣu LV 329.13; prapatiṣu or °tīṣu Mv ii.326.10; 333.15 (Dict. s.v. prapati); prapatinsu Hoernle MR 136 for SP 329.3; patiṃsū LV 233.18; saṃnipate (3 pl.) Mv i.303.19; prapatetsuḥ Mv i.42.1 ff.; saṃnipatensuḥ Mv iii.113.12
Ger. nipatitva LV 119.2; saṃnipatitvāna Mv iii.42.10
(2) **ut-patta-ti*, go forth, fly up; see Dict.
Ppp. utpattitā (mss. °to) Mv i.26.3
Ger. utpattitvā Mv i.6.8 ff.; ii.243.11; utpattitvāna Mv iii.456.5 (parallel to i.11.15 where mss. are confused, Senart utpatitvāna)
(3) Caus. *pātaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. prapātehi Mv iii.168.5; in non-caus. mg. (§ 38.23; or denom.? Dict.), pple. vinipātentā Mv i.30.3
Fut. prapātiṣyase LV 334.9
Aor. pātayetsuḥ Mv iii.428.7
Inf. vinipātanāya KP 48.7 (vs)

pattīya-ti, *patīya-ti* (rare), *pratīya-ti*, believe: cf. Pali pattiyāyati, Śaur. Mg. pattiāadi, but (closer to our form) AMg. JM. pattiyai, pattiai; derived by Pischel (487), Sheth, Ratnach., from prati with yā or i, which may be supported by our occasional pratīy°, if this is not false Hyperskt. But PTSD takes the Pali verb as denom. to -pattiya in para-pattiya, believing someone else (so correct PTSD; always adj.; there is no noun meaning 'belief in someone else')
Pres. pattīyati Mv ii.110.9; 208.6; iii.189.14; KP 16.8; °yasi Śikṣ 174.7, 18; °yanti Śikṣ 174.15; pratīyasi Kv 54.12, 16; impv. pattīyata SP 44.3; pratīyatha Sukh 97.5; 99.6; pratīya Mv ii.223.20, mss., Senart em. pattīya, perhaps rightly (metr. better)
Fut. pattīyiṣyanti SP 286.8; 312.9; pratīyiṣyanti SP 36.7; 37.10 (Kashgar rec. pattī° both times); patīṣyanti Mmk 73.15 (§ 31.4)
Ppp. pattīyita- Mv ii.249.14
Caus. Fut. pattīyāpayiṣyāmy SP 288.5 (prose; Kashgar rec. pattīyāpayāmi)

pad-, attain: (1) *-padya-te, -ti* (Skt.); also -padyesi (Aor.), -padye-tum (Inf., below), § 38.21
Pres. āpadyati (in caus. mg., § 38.24) Mv i.181.10; opt. (caus. mg., § 38.24) utpadyema Mv i.365.10; (not caus.) utpadye Mv iii.6.19; impv. upapadyāhi Mv ii.2.12; upapadyahi Mv ii.2.10
Fut. āpadyiṣyanti Mv i.360.5; upapadyiṣyati Mv iii.42.20; āpadyehaṃ? Mv ii.120.16 (§ 31.21)
Aor. samupapadyi Mv ii.9.22 (= i.206.6 where read samupapadye, also aor.); upapadyiṣu Mv ii.350.7; utpadye Mv i.59.14; °yet Mv ii.194.8; pratipadyetsuḥ Mv iii.289.11; pratipadyitha Mv i.12.9 (§ 32.42); upapadyitha (id.) i.268.14; 305.2; ii.220.7; upapadyesi (mss.; 3 sg.) Mv i.45.10 (§ 32.67)
Ger. samāpadyitvā Mv i.357.16; upapadyitvā Mv iii.404.7
Inf. upapadyituṃ Mv iii.404.8; samāpadyetuṃ Mmk 514.24; pratipadyetuṃ Mmk 540.28 (§ 36.8)
(2) Caus. *-pādaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. utpādayi SP 284.3; niṣpādayī (3 pl.) SP 131.2; impv. utpādehi Mv i.233.10
Aor. udapādayi Mv i.190.16; utpādesi Mv i.38.10; utpādaye (mss. °yo) Mv i.181.7; samupādayetsuḥ (§§ 2.88; 32.103) Suv 151.11; utpādetsuḥ Mv i.44.7
Gdve. samupādanīya- (§ 2.88) Śikṣ 107.18
Pass. (a) (utpādyate, Skt.) Aor. utpādye Mv i.3.4
(b) pratipādīyati Divy 226.21 (mss.)
(3) Miscellaneous
Pres. pple. -utpadanta-, §§ 18.5; 28.30
(Fut. -padiṣyati, only by error, see § 31.1)

Aor. udapāsi, originated, was produced, Mv i.248.7 etc. (§ 32.60)

parikarmaya-ti, adorn, make fit (Skt.), denom.
Aor. parikarmaye (mss.) Mv i.3.12

parinda-ti, parīnda-ti, present (also anup-°), not recorded elsewhere; taken by Burnouf, Lotus 417, as connected with dā-; see Dict.
Pres. parindāmi SP 484.5; LV 443.9 (so with v.l., text paridāmi); anuparindāmi SP 410.10; 420.12; 484.5; LV 91.8; 443.9; Dbh.g. 56(82).5; parīndāmy anuparīndāmi AsP 460.14; 461.12
Fut. anuparindiṣyāmo LV 90.22
Ppp. parindita- Mv i.141.13 (°tārtha-); parīndita- Vaj 20.4, 10 (but in Hoernle MR 179 parin°); AsP 218.18

palāy-, palāya-ti, flee (Skt.)
Ppp. palāta- Śikṣ 347.4 (§ 34.12); palāna- Mv ii.172.16; niṣpalāna- MSV i.288.10; prapalīna- (? most mss.) Mv i.71.2; § 34.19
Caus. pple. niṣpālāyita- Bhīk 28b.1 (§ 38.14)

pallāna-ti, saddle, harness: JM. pallāṇei, Skt. paryāṇayati (§ 2.16), denom.
Pres. pple. pallānatena (so with mss.; instr.) Mv ii.160.4

paśya-ti, see (Skt.); once *-paśyaya-te*, non-caus. (pres. pple.), also *paśye-hi* (impv.), § 38.21
Pres. opt. paśye Mv ii.360.22; paśyeyā, °ya Mv ii.150.6, 13; 151.19; 153.18; paśyiya Suv 52.5; paśyesi (2 sg.) SP 98.4; impv. paśyāhi Mv ii.28.4; paśyahi Mv ii.447.2 (mss.); paśyehi Mv i.187.4 (mss.); pple. vipaśyayamāna- Bhad 39
Fut. paśyiṣyāmi Mv ii.479.3
Aor. saṃpaśyī (§ 32.121; 2 sg.) LV 195.20; paśyi (3 pl.) LV 75.15; paśyiṣu SP 15.5; °su SP 194.7; paśyetsu(ḥ) Mv i.342.12
Ger. paśya Mv i.192.9; vipaśya SP 282.6 (§ 35.16); paśyitvā Mv i.302.10; paśyiya Mv i.312.14; paśyiyāna Mv ii.225.11; paśyi Dbh.g. 4(340).19; [paśyitūna, see § 35.36]
Inf paśyitum Samādh 22.17; paśyatuṃ (or °tu, mss.) Mv ii.484.15 (§ 36.7); paśyanāya Mv ii.450.14; paśyanāye Mv ii.456.8, 14
Pass. (§ 37.20) paśyati LV 419.12; opt. paśyeta LV 29.8
Caus. paśyayanti Dbh.g. 48(74).26 (§ 38.9)

pā-, drink: (1) *piba-ti* (Skt.), also with v for b
Pres. impv. pibāhi Mv ii.430.16
Fut. pibiṣyati Mv ii.242.11
Aor. pibe Mv iii.173.7
Ger. pibitvā Mv iii.144.14
Inf. pivituṃ LV 309.15; pibanāye Mv ii.432.4, 5
Caus. opt. pivāpayet, and Inf. pivāpayetu-(kāma-), § 36.8, Kashgar rec. of SP for pāyayeyam, pāyayitu-, 322.2 (prose).
(2) Miscellaneous forms
Ger. pitvā; so both edd. LV 242.14 (?MIndic i for ī; cf. § 3.38; Pali records pitvā and pītvā). But Lefm. Crit. App. cites pitvā as v.l. of several mss. and Calc., implying that he meant to print a different reading (presumably pītvā) in his text
Caus. pāyanti (for pāyayanti, § 38.28) Mv i.8.5 (mss.) pāpayati Divy 398.17 (§ 38.64)

pālaya-ti, protect (Skt.), denom.
Pres. impv. pālehi LV 79.17

**piccaya-ti* (Skt. Gr.) or **picca-ti*, squeeze, torment (piccita-, Suśr.); not in Pali, Pkt.
Ppp. piccita- Mv i.21.14; 24.4
Pass. piccīyanti Mv i.24.3, 5

pithaya-ti, rarely *pitha-ti*, cover, shut, block; MIndic, see Dict.
Pres. pithayati LV 257.2; pithanti Gv 63.15 (prose; 2d ed. em. wrongly); opt. pithayet Mmk 287.1; 362.15; impv. pithetha LV 201.17; pithayata LV 228.2; pple. pithad Śikṣ 348.11
Fut. pithayiṣyati Gv 112.20 (text pithapayiṣyati, which might perhaps be fut. to a caus. pithapayati, like dapeti to dā, etc.)
Ppp. pithita- SP 260.9; Śikṣ 307.3; su-pīthita- (§ 3.18) Gv 55.1
Ger. pithayitvā Mmk 560.27
Inf. pithitum LV 46.7
Pass. pithīyate Ud xvi.9, 10; Caus. (to pithiyati) 2 sg. opt. pithiyeyāsi (so, or pihi°, mss.), you are to cause to be covered Mv iii.25.6 (§§ 29.37; 38.12)

pilipalipāye-ti, rattle (onomat.); nowhere recorded
Pres. °pāyeti, and impv. °pāyehi Mv iii.179.16

pīḍaya-ti, oppress (Skt.)
Pres. pple. °yantā, with pass. mg. (§ 37.18), Mv i.5.10
Aor. pīḍesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.175.13; abhipīḍayet Mv i.68.15; abhinipīḍe (1 sg.) Mv ii.124.2
Ger. nipīḍiya Mv i.113.15

pīṣaya-ti, pīṣa-ti, crush: AMg. pīsai; cf. ápīṣan AV 4.6.7, praty-apīṣan Mbh 2.42.27 (Crit. ed.); Pali has, besides piṃsati, pass. pisīyati and ppp. pisita- which point to a Skt. *piṣati (epic piṣeyam etc., for regular pinaṣṭi); see § 28.4
Pres. pīṣayanti Mv ii.273.15; opt. pīṣayet Mmk 82.15; Suv 105.4; impv. pīṣehi Mv ii.427.9; pīṣahi Mv iii.3.17; pple. niṣpīṣanto MSV ii.76.7
Aor. pīṣetsuḥ Mv ii.275.6
Ger. pīṣayitvā Mmk 81.29; Divy 409.18

pu-, cleanse, winnow: **puna-ti*, § 28.5
Caus. Gdve. opunāpayitavya- Mv iii.178.5

puñch-, see *poñch-*

puṣ-, Caus. *poṣaya-ti*, make thrive (Skt.)
Ger. poṣiya Mv ii.241.15
Pass. pple. poṣiyantā Mv ii.223.9 (mss.)

pū-, see *pu-*

pūjaya-ti, revere (Skt.), denom.
Pres. pūjima (§ 27.10) Dbh.g. 19(355).9; opt. pūjeya Mv i.270.1; impv. pūjehi Mv i.234.3
Aor. pūjayi Mv i.61.16; pūjayesi Mv i.60.1 (see § 32.66); pūjayet Mv ii.119.3; °yetsuḥ Mv ii.286.12
Ger. pūjitva SP 217.9
Inf. pūjanāya RP 5.10; pūjanā LV 282.8 (§ 36.18)

pṛ-, fill: 'Caus.' *pūraya-ti* (Skt.), also *pūra-ti, pura(ya)-ti, pūrya-ti*
Pres. paripūrati (v.l. °rayati, apparently unmetr., § 38.28) Mv iii.356.6; opt. pureya (u m.c. ? Dict.) Suv 37.13; paripūrye Śikṣ 34.1 (prose; Dict.); prapūraye (1 sg.) Suv 30.4; pūrayi (1 sg.) Bhad 41; prapūreyaṃ Mv i.53.10
Aor. pūriṣu LV 387.3
Ger. pūritvana KP 20.23 (vs)
Pass. pple. pūriyantasya Mv ii.76.10; impv. (3 sg., § 30.14) paripūryato LV 235.19

pṛcch-, ask: (1) *pṛccha-ti* (Skt.), also *pṛcche-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. pṛcchenti Mv i.256.10; paripṛcchesi Mv ii.298.3 (v.l. °asi); opt. pṛcche (2 sg.) LV 231.17; pṛcchesi (2 sg.) Mv i.254.17; impv. pṛcchāhi Mv ii.155.5
Fut. pṛcchiṣyate Suv 216.9
Aor. pṛcchī (3 pl.) LV 421.18; pṛcchet Mv iii.242.6; pṛcchetsu(ḥ) Mv ii.271.1; pṛcchīya (§ 32.105) Mv iii.85.2
Ppp. pṛcchita- Mv i.232.15; Suv 134.3
Ger. a-pṛcchitvā Suv 142.6; an-āpṛcchiyāna Mv ii.272.12
Inf. pṛcchitum SP 280.1; pṛcchatum (mss.; § 36.7) Mv iii.394.17; paripṛcchanāya Mv iii.48.8
Gdve. pṛcchitavya- Mv i.272.4; paripṛcchanīya- Mv i.337.17
Pass. pṛcchīyati Mv ii.13.21; pṛcchiyati (v.l. pṛcchī°) Mv ii.207.3; iii.39.19; pṛcchasi (§ 37.32) Mv i.280.5
(2) Miscellaneous forms
Ppp. praṣṭa- Mv iii.166.12; § 34.13
Blend of ppp. and pres. pple. pṛṣṭamāna (§ 34.1) Mvy 6993

pṛś-, *pṛs-*, see *spṛś-*

poñcha-te (also *puñch-* ?), wipe off, clean (MIndic): Pali puñchati, Pkt. puṃchai (Skt. proñchati)
Pres. poñchate Divy 491.12; impv. poñchasva Divy 491.7
Inf. puñchitum (? so mss. in 7) or poñchitum Divy 491.7, 8

pracalāya-ti, -te, nod (the head, in sleep): Pali pacalāyati (Skt. ppp. pracalāyita- and n. act. °yana-)
Pres. pple. pracalāyataḥ (gen. sg.) Jm 233.8; °yamāna- Gv 405.9

**prajñapta(ya)-ti*, provide (seats), denom. to prajñapta
Caus. ppp. prajñaptāpita- Mv iii.93.3, 4 (§ 38.56)

prajñāya-ti (denom.), know, be conscious of (from prajñā, noun); also *-prajñāya-te*, there is consciousness (of . . .)
Pres. prajñāyanti Mv i.52.10; (jāti-, etc.) -prajñāyate LV 19.12 (wrongly Weller 18)

pratibhāge-ti (denom.), give a share in
Pres. impv. pratibhāgehi Mv ii.426.8 (by em.; mss. °bhānehi, °bhāṇehi)

pratīya-ti, see *pattīya-ti*

prath-, spread (Skt.)
Ppp. pṛthita- Śikṣ 247.16 (§ 34.14)

praśna-ti, -te, interrogate (denom.): Pali paripañhati AN v.16.2 (Skt. praśnayati, which also occurs here); § 38.35
Pres. praśnasi Mmk 666.23 (prose); paripraśnase Mmk 218.17 (prose)
Gdve. paripraśnitavya- Mmk 229.16 (prose)

prasavati, prasavāyati, deliver (of a child); prob. denom. to Skt. prasava
Ppp. prasavitā Divy 485.12; prasavāyitā 484.8 (see Dict. and § 38.38)

1 *phara-ti*, suffuse, fill (also 1 *phala-*, *sphṛ-*, qq.v.): Pali pharati
Pres. pharanti Gv 236.6; opt. pharetha, pharema Mv iii.374.11, 16 (mss. har°)
Aor. phari Gv 240.25
Ger. pharitvā Gv 236.8

2 *pharati*, jump (= Skt. phalati?)
Ger. utpharitvā(?) Mv ii.249.16 (see Dict.)

pharapharāya-te, crash(?), onomat.: Ap. pharaharantu (Dict.)
Pres. °yate Mmk 674.4

1 *phala-ti*, suffuse, fill (= 1 *phara-*, *sphṛ-*)
Aor. phalī Mv ii.349.17
Ger. phalitvā (mss.) Mv iii.124.15

2 *phala-ti*, burst (Skt.)
Pres. opt. phaleyā LV 81.19

bandh-, bind: (1) *bandha-ti* (very rare in Skt.): Pali id.; § 28.14
Pres. bandhati Mv ii.90.16; opt. bandheya Mv ii.178.16; impv. ābandhāhi Mv iii.25.5; bandhatha Mv i.329.17
Aor. anubandhiṣu Mv ii.198.11; anubandhensu Mv iii.96.22; °tsuḥ Mv iii.323.2
Ger. bandhitvā SP 273.10; prabandhitvāna Mv iii.281.19; bandhiya Mv i.272.11, 12
Inf. bandhitum (reported once from Rām., BR) Mv ii.484.5
Gdve. bandhitavya- Mv iii.55.8; a-vibandhiya- Dbh.g 41(67).4 (§ 34.26)
Caus. impv. bandhāpetha Mv i.258.9; ger. °petvā Mv iii.175.6; gdve. bandhāpayitavya- Mmk 529.20
(2) *bandhaya-ti*, *bandhe-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. bandhesi Mv ii.483.7 = iii.18.10; anubandheti Mv iii.294.19; anubandhayāmaḥ LV 47.7, 21; 48.7; impv. anubandhayatāṃ LV 46.2, 12
Ger. bandhayitvā Mv ii.168.6
(3) *baddha-ti* (*baddhayati?), denom. to baddha-, § 28.19
Pres. impv. ābaddhāhi Mv ii.492.8; anubaddhitāṃ LV 45.4 (§ 27.10); pple. anubaddhanto Mv ii.241.5 (but cf. § 34.2); [baddhamāna-, see § 34.1]
Ger. baddhitvā Mv iii.7.5
Caus. Gdve. baddhāpayitavya- Mmk 50.16

balīya-ti (denom.), grow strong, prevail: Pali id.
Pres. °ti Mv i.275.10; ii.423.10 (here text bahvīyati; see Dict.)

bādh-, oppress: (1) *bādha-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. bādhiṣu LV 357.6 (read °ṣū)
(2) Pass. bādhya-te (Skt.)
Fut. bādhyiṣyate LV 366.2 (? by em.)
Aor. vādhyī LV 222.6 (3 pl.)
(3) ? *-bādhya-ti* (active, trans.)
Pres. saṃbādhyati Mv ii.146.1; so text with one ms.; the other bodhati, perhaps indicating that the true reading was (saṃ-)bādhati

bāṣpāya-ti, -te (denom.), steam, turn to vapor
Pres. pple. bāṣpāyantaḥ LV 251.8, 12; vāṣpāyamāna- Divy 462.2 (here text with mss. vāpyā°), 6
Aor. bāṣpāyetsu(ḥ) Mv ii.124.4, 5, 8

bāhaya-ti, remove, put out or aside: Pali bāheti (cf. Senart's note Mv i.431; to bahis, bāhya-)
Ger. vāhetvā Ud xi.12 (see Dict.)
Ppp. bāhita- LV 353.14 etc.

bukka-ti, bark (only Dhātup., and not in MIndic)
Pres. bukkati Karmav 22.7; 26.1

budh-, become aware, be enlightened: (1) *budhya-te, -ti* (Skt.)
Pres. paribudhyāmi Mv ii.66.15; 444.16, 21; opt. budhyeya Mv ii.160.5; vibudhyiya (1 sg.) Bhad 41 (but prob.

read with v.l. vibuddhiya); impv. budhyāhi Mv ii.158.12
Fut. budhyiṣyate SP 343.14 (2 mss. buddhisyate, sic! with s)
Aor. samanubudhye Mv i.4.10; budhyiṣu (read bhadra bu°) Gv 34.21; budhyasi (3 sg., § 32.62) Mv ii.336.15, budhyansu 19 (§ 32.76)
Ger. budhyitva Gv 315.20; abhisaṃbudhyitvā or °tva Mv ii.419.1; iii.246.3 (in both v.l. °ddhi°)
Inf. budhyitum LV 270.21; RP 19.9, 15; budhyanāya LV 271.4
(Caus. budhyāpayati: see budhyāpaka, °pana, Dict.)
(2) *buddha-ti*, denom. to buddha- (§ 28.19)
Pres. opt. buddhe Mv ii.377.5; 378.20; vibuddhi Mv i.155.19; buddhema LV 361.10; saṃbuddheyuḥ Suv 107.12 (Nobel em. °budhe°); abhisaṃbuddheyaṃ Sādh 225.8; impv. pratibuddhatha Ud xv.7, so oldest ms., changed later to °budhyata (ms. °taḥ)
Fut. vibuddhiṣyati Mv ii.160.8; iii.39.10, 11, 12; buddhiṣyanti Mv ii.173.13; abhisaṃbuddhiṣyati Mv ii.313.11; °si Mv ii.400.14; °ṣyāmi Mv ii.265.17; 314.16; abhisaṃbuddheṣya (1 sg.) Mv ii.404.19 (§ 31.33)
Aor. buddhiṣū LV 220.12; abhisaṃbuddhe Mv ii.285.3; anubuddhi LV 299.12 (§ 32.23)
Ger. buddhitvā (§ 35.28) LV 163.19; 164.12; Mv iii.273.1, etc.; °tva LV 231.19; 355.15; Mv ii.323.19 etc.
Ppp. buddhita- Mv i.209.23; so mss., Senart em. budhita-, § 2.89, which meter requires; same line ii.13.20 text with mss. bodhita- despite meter; read budhita- both times, prob. m.c. for buddhita-, but cf. (4) below
(3) *bodha-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. abhisaṃbodhitvā Mv i.312.18; ii.348.15 (v.l. here °buddhitvā)
(4) *-budhati*? § 28.30
Pres. abhisaṃbudhati, v.l. for °budhyati Mvy 6907; pple. abhisaṃbudhāna- Ud xviii.18 (§ 34.4)
Fut. abhisaṃbudhiṣyaṃ Mv ii.265.6 (so text, no v.l.; prose; § 31.32)
(5) Caus. *bodhaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. bodhehi LV 177.22
Aor. pratibodhayiṣu LV 173.9
Pass. ger. bodhyitvā, having been made enlightened, Mv i.170.9 (v.l. buddhyitvā)
(6) Miscellaneous
Pres. pple. buddhyāyamāna- Divy 574.8 (Dict.; prob. denom.)
Gdve. saṃbodheya- Mv iii.74.1 (§ 34.24)

bṛṃhaya-ti, promote (Skt.)
Pres. opt. bṛṃhaye (vṛ°) Ud xviii.5

(ā-)bṛh-, *vṛh-*, tear, pluck: °*hati* (Skt.). See also *(ā-)vṛh-*
Ppp. ābṛḍha-, ābrīḍha-, ābūḍha- (Dict.)

brū-, speak: *bravī-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. brūmi, § 28.64, to be read in Mv i.280.14 etc. (so Senart sometimes, as ii.50.2); see Dict. s.v. [kruhi]; impv. bravīhi (§ 28.60) SP 93.11 (Kashgar rec.)
Preterite abravī (v.l. °vīt; § 32.21) Mv ii.61.10; abravītsu (§ 32.37) Mv i.186.11; abravīṣi (3 sg.; § 32.71) Mv ii.54.4

bhakṣaya-ti or *bhakṣa-ti*, eat (both Skt.)
Caus. opt. bhakṣāpayet Mmk 82.21

1 *bhaj-*: *bhaja-ti*, share, revere (Skt.)
Pres. opt. bhaje Mv ii.66.21; saṃbhajeya Mv ii.67.2; impv. vibhajahi LV 165.8
Fut. bhajahe (? 3 sg., § 31.20) Mv iii.355.14

2 *bhaj-*, *bhañj-*, break: (1) *bhañja-ti*: Pali id. (trans. and intrans.); § 28.4; once ger. of -bhañjaya-ti, non-caus.
Pres. bhañjati LV 175.17 (intrans., is broken; § 37.16); bhañjante Divy 343.16 (so mss.; trans., they break)
Fut. bhañjiṣyāmi Mv ii.280.4
Aor. prābhañjīt SP 159.1 (prose), § 32.45
Ger. bhañjitvā Mv i.30.8; °tva Mv ii.308.18; prabhañjayitvā (not caus.) SP 159.1 (prose)
(2) *bhaja-ti*? Not recorded elsewhere, and doubtful; §§ 2.89; 28.31
Pres. prabhajanti Mv i.30.7 (prose); so ed. without v.l. But in next line bhaṃjitvā. Misprint, or error of mss., for °bhaṃj°?
Fut. bhajiṣyati Mv iii.23.19, passive in mg., will be broken. So Senart with one ms.; v.l. bhaṃj°, which is metrically bad; might be m.c. for bhaṃj° or bhajj° (bhajy°, see next)
(3) *bhajja-ti*, passive, MIndic for bhajyate
Pres. bhajjati Mv iii.65.9 (v.l. bhajyati)
Fut. bhajjiṣyati Mv ii.489.20 (v.l. bhaṃj°)

bhaṇa-ti, speak (Skt.), also *bhaṇe-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. bhaṇesi Mv ii.222.19; bhaṇāti Mv iii.268.8 (prose; § 27.4); opt. bhaṇe Mv ii.176.6; bhaṇeya SP 58.6; bhaṇesi Mv ii.224.7; impv. bhaṇāhi LV 56.12; bhaṇahi LV 91.18 (ed. bhaṇa hi)
Aor. bhaṇi LV 166.17; bhaṇe Mv ii.238.14; prabhaṇiṣu LV 164.20; bhaṇāsi Mv ii.221.7 (§ 32.59); saṃprabhaṇīṣu LV 167.10 (Dict.; perh. m.c. for °bhāṇ°, caus.)
(Ppp. pratibhāṇita- Mv ii.37.17; if correct, prob. ā m.c.; but v.l. °bhaṇ°)

bhaṇḍaya-ti, quarrel (Skt. Gr.): Pali bhaṇḍati; with vi-, distort (the face)
Pres. pratibhaṇḍayati KP 107.3; Bbh 170.20; bhaṇḍayate KP 107.25; vibhaṇḍayati Divy 263.14, °yasi 15
Ppp. bhaṇḍita- Mvy 8711; KP 107.3, 5; Bbh 170.20; Bhīk 31a.4
Gdve. pratibhaṇḍitavya- Mvy 8711; Bhīk 31a.4

bharts-, abuse: *bhaccha(ya)-ti*, *bhatsa(ya)-ti* (= Skt. bharts°; §§ 2.17, 18; respectively MIndic, and imperfect Sktization): Pali (nib)bhaccheti (aor. °esi Jāt. ii.338.5); see also Dict. s.v. nirbhatsanā (noun)
Pres. pple. avabhatsayanto SP 114.6 (so all Nep. mss.; ed. em. °bharts°; Kashgar rec. wholly different)
Ppp. nirbhacchita- RΓ 32.14; nirbhātsita- Mvy 7183 (? see Dict.)
Ger. nirbhatsya LV 319.10 (prose; both edd., no v.l.); bhatsiya (most mss.) or bhartsiya (one ms. and WT) SP 114.9 (KN em. bhartsayi)

1 *bhā-*, shine: (1) *bhāya-ti* (§ 38.24): Pali (paṭi-)bhāyissati, fut. (PTSD s.v. paṭibhāti), Pkt. (apparently not AMg.) bhāyai, paḍihāyai
Pres. pratibhāyati LV 222.18; Mv iii.9.11 = 10.2; 38.3; °si Mv ii.297.11; °nti Mv ii.297.12; 480.13; impv. °yatu Mv iii.48.9
Aor. bhāyi (v.l. hāyi) Mv ii.308.16; pratibhāye Mv ii.122.11; °yetsuḥ Mv ii.121.1
(2) Miscellaneous
Aor. prabhāsi Mv ii.345.8 (or from pra-bhās with ending i; § 32.54; cf. also obhāsi under bhās)

2 *bhā-ti*, fear, see under *bhī-*

bhāṣ-, speak: (1) *bhāṣa-ti* (Skt.)

Pres. adhyabhāṣati Mv i.81.3 (etc.; augmented; § 32.8); opt. bhāṣe SP 98.7; bhāṣi SP 236.8; bhāṣeya (mss.) Mv ii.258.15; bhāṣesi (2 sg.) Mv iii.384.16; impv. bhāṣato (3 sg., § 30.14) LV 7.11
Fut. bhāṣahe (1 sg., § 31.20) Mmk 577.16
Aor. abhāṣi (3 pl.) SP 194.3; bhāṣe Mv i.29.4; bhāṣiṣu LV 352.20; abhāṣitha Mv iii.438.11; adhyabhāṣita Mv iii.135.17 (§ 32.42); abhāṣire Mmk 231.20 (§ 32.43); adhyabhāṣasi (3 sg.) Mv i.55.6 (§ 32.62); abhyabhāṣeran Mv i.56.13 (§ 32.105)
Ppp. (§ 34.11) bhāṣṭa- Laṅk 283.8; su-bhāṣṭa- LV 230.13; ābhāṣṭa- Mv ii.157.16, etc.; pratyanubhāṣṭa- iii.393.17
Ger. bhāṣitva (so mss., m.c.) Mv ii.299.16; bhāṣiya SP 23.11
Inf. bhāṣaṇāya SP 28.6

(2) *bhāṣaya-ti*, non-caus. (so rarely in Skt., bhāṣayeta Mbh. Crit. ed. 5.44.11); note Pali paribhāseti = paribhāsati Jāt. iv.285.8
Aor. ābhāṣayiṃsu (text ābhās°) LV 353.6; adhyabhāṣaye Mv iii.327.5
Ger. paribhāṣayitvā SP 213.4
Inf. paribhāṣayitum Bhīk 5b.3
Gdve. paribhāṣayitavya- Bhīk 5b.3

(3) *bhāṣya-ti*, nowhere recorded
Pres. impv. bhāṣya Laṅk 351.12

bhās-, shine: (1) *bhāsa-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. obhāsi Mv ii.335.17 (or to avabhāti; cf. also prabhāsi under *bhā*); prabhāsiṣu Mv ii.307.1; bhāsetsu Mv ii.306.14
Ger. obhāsitvā Mv iii.94.11

(2) Caus. *bhāsaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. avabhāsayāhi Gv 54.12
Aor. avabhāsayī SP 9.4
Pass. (? or ya-present from simplex?) avabhāsyante LV 352.8 (perhaps, are made to be resplendent ?); pple. avabhāsyantaḥ (n. pl.) LV 351.22

bhid-, split: (1) *bhinda-ti*: Pali id.; § 28.4. Also (ger.) *bhindaya-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. bhindāmi Mv i.335.1; vyatibhindati Ud xxxi.17–22; opt. bhinde Mv ii.330.3; impv. bhindata LV 306.5; pple. bhindanto (n. sg. m.) Mv i.335.1
Aor. bhindi (2 sg.) LV 370.22
Ger. bhinditvā Mv ii.239.16; bhindayitvanā LV 73.21 (so with v.l., text bhindiy°)
Inf. bhinditum Samādh p. 17 line 4

(2) Pass. *bhidya-te* (Skt.), and MIndic *bhijja-te* (§ 2.14); once *-bhidya-ti*, active (4th class?)
Pres. opt. bhidyeya Sukh 45.13; nirbhidyet Laṅk 24.14, active (4th class?) in form and mg.
Aor. bhijje Mv ii.412.11

(3) Miscellaneous
(Pres. bhinanmi 1 sg. LV 309.10, 20, both edd.; best mss. bhinadmi, bhinatmi. Cf. Whitney 161b; Wackernagel I §§ 164, 176 for similar stray forms in Skt., regarded by Whitney as false readings. Against this Bartholomae ZDMG 50.712 f.)
Ger. bhetvāna Mv ii.12.16 (§ 35.35)

bhī- fear: (1) *bhāya-ti*; Pali id.; analogical to quasi-antonym trāyate, Pali tāyati, rescue; cf. (2) bhā-ti and § 28.23
Pres. bhāyati Mv ii.236.9; °si Mv i.163.18; Ud ix.3 (later ms. bibheṣi); °se Mv ii.58.19; impv. bhāya Mv ii.134.3; Śikṣ 154.17; bhāyāhi Mv i.363.1; iii.408.11 (here v.l. bhāhi); bhāyatha or °thā SP 26.4; 197.1; Mv i.361.15; iii.303.17
Aor. bhāyi Mv ii.308.16

(2) *bhā-ti*: M.bhāi, 'by analogy with roots in *ā*' (Pischel 501), or more specifically with quasi-antonym trāti (cf. under bhāya-ti)
Pres. impv. bhāhi LV 232.3, so read for tāhi, allegedly with nearly all mss. (but v.l. bhāhi); Tib. ḥjigs, fear. Same Mv iii.403.17, and v.l. iii.408.11 (above)

(3) Miscellaneous forms
Aor. (injunctive) bhīhi Mv ii.489.6, 16, § 30.10; bhaiṣṭatha, °ta Mmk 4.14–15 (text °tu); 182.23 etc. (§ 32.84)

bhīṣaya-ti, frighten (Skt., caus. to bhī)
Caus. opt. bhīṣāpayet Prāt 518.10

1 *bhuj-*, enjoy: (1) *bhuñja-ti* (Skt. sporadically, 'U +' Wh. Roots): Pali id.; § 28.4
Pres. bhuñjati Mv ii.1.10; opt. bhuñje (1 sg.) Mv ii.164.14; paribhuñjeyā Mv iii.312.2; paribhuñjesi (2 sg.) Mv iii.311.10; impv. bhuñjāhi Mv ii.55.21
Fut. bhuñjiṣyati Mv ii.242.11; bhuñjehaṃ (1 sg., § 31.21) Mv ii.131.9
Aor. paribhuñji LV 387.7; bhuñjesi Mv iii.129.8; upabhuñje Mv ii.204.19; paribhuñjetsu(ḥ) Mv i.343.18
Ppp. paribhuñjita- Mv i.19.4
Ger. bhuñjitvā Mv i.306.19; paribhuñjiya Mv ii.96.18; bhuñjiyāna Mv iii.120.18
Inf. bhuñjituṃ Mv ii.56.3
Caus. bhuñjāventi (§ 38.69) Mv i.12.6; ger. paribhuñjāpetvā (§ 38.53) Mv iii.148.15

(2) *bhuja-ti*, perhaps by adaptation to homonymous root *bhuj*, bend: Ap. bhujantu (pres. pple. n. sg. m.) Jacobi, Sanatk. 665.7; and Sheth cites from a gram. source (Ṣaḍbhāṣācandrikā) bhuai, bhuae. The converse adaptation leads to *bhuñjati*, bends, q.v.
Pres. ? in Mv i.8.5 (prose) Senart bhuṃjantām (3 pl. impv.), mss. mostly bhūjānta, °te, °to; also bhūṃj°; uncertain; in Mv i.27.5 (prose) Senart em. paribhujantāṃ (acc. pl. m. pple.), most mss. parivrajantāṃ (seems meaningless; one inferior ms. °bhuṃjatāṃ); in Mv i.88.7 (vs) Senart bhuṃjanti, metrically correct, but with one inferior ms.; the rest bhujanti, metrically poor, yet not worse than many other metrical passages as recorded in Mv.
Ger. bhujitva LV 74.6 (vs; could be understood as m.c. for bhuñjitvā)

(3) Caus. *bhojaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. bhojehi Mv i.309.10
Caus., blend form (or true caus. to bhojeti? § 38.61) bhojāpehi Mv i.305.10

(4) Desid. (unredupl.) ppp. bhukṣita-, see § 40.2, Dict., also s.v. bhukṣa

2 *bhuj-*, bend: (1) *bhuja-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. ābhujitvā (Pali id.) LV 259.5); Mv ii.268.4 (v.l. ābhuṃj°); ābhujiya LV 133.20

(2) *-bhuñja-ti*, perhaps by adaptation to homonymous root *bhuj-*, enjoy; cf. the reverse adaptation *bhuja-ti*, enjoy. The v.l. ābhuṃjitvā for ābhujitvā is recorded in Pali MN i.56.13
Pres. (?) ābhuṃjasi Mv ii.403.6, text; but meter is better with v.l. ābhujasi (-bhuja-, two shorts = one long)
Ger. ābhuṃjitvā Mv i.144.11 (prose); ii.131.15; 313.14; and text in i.213.8 (prose, mss. corrupt) = ii.16.12 (here with one ms., v.l. ābhujitvā)

bhū-, become: (1) *bhava-ti* (Skt.); m.c. also *bhāvati* (§ 3.11), q.v. Dict.
Pres. opt. bhave LV 56.1; bhavi SP 175.7; bhaveyā SP 313.7; °ya SP 53.3; bhaveyyā Mv i.331.8; bhaviya LV 78.11; bhavesi (2 sg.) Mv i.233.8; impv. bhavāhi Mv ii.230.6; bhavahi LV 241.20; imperf. bhava LV 166.5 (§ 32.115)

Fut. bhaviṣya RP 29.12 (§ 31.34); conditional abhaviṣyati Mv i.267.7 (mss.; § 31.40); abhaviṣyaṃ (3 sg., § 31.39) Mv iii.107.10 (mss.)
Aor. bhavi RP 27.12 (read tatra bhavi); bhave (§ 32.87) RP 23.16 (1 sg.; § 32.87; read yadā bhave, or (a)bhave); prādurbhave Mv i.221.6 (v.l. °vet) = °bhavet ii.23.11; prādurbhaveya Mv i.340.12 (§ 32.105); bhaveyuḥ (id.) Mmk 130.19, 26; prādurbhavetsuḥ (or °vensu; so mss.) Mv iii.180.15; prādurbhavinsu Hoernle MR 136 for SP 329.2; bhavesi Mv ii.350.3
Ger. bhavitvā LV 79.19; °tvāna Mv iii.2.2; bhaviya LV 297.9; bhavī Śikṣ 345.13

(2) *bho-ti, ho-ti*: Pali hoti. Cf. § 1.29. In BHS the bh-forms are much commoner than the h- forms; yet bh- in such contracted forms (with o for ava or avi) seems not recorded in Pali; but it occurs in western Aśokan and in later Prakrits (Pischel 475)
Pres. (bh-forms common) bhoti SP 92.8; Mv i.16.1; Suv 4.10; Samādh 22.22; Bhad 51; bhomi SP 89.11; prabhomi LV 56.1; bhonti SP 90.7; hoti (rare) Mv i.208.2 = ii.12.11; impv. bhohi LV 237.9
Fut. bhoṣyanti SP 330.9; bhoṣyi (1 sg. mid.) SP 291.13 (these forms are questionable; § 31.14); bhohī (2 sg.) LV 196.4; hohī (2 sg.; read hohī ti with some mss.) Mv i.44.3; hohisi Mv i.337.9; hohiti (sometimes v.l. hohīti) Mv i.208.5 = ii.12.14; ii.13.3; 40.20 (twice); as 3 pl. (mss.) Mv ii.206.13; hohati Mv ii.225.5; 405.12 (mss.; 3, not 2 sg.); hohanti Mv ii.224.21. On all these see §§ 31.16, 17.
Aor. bhosiṣu (? 3 pl.; § 32.78) Sukh 7.13 (vs)

(3) stem *bhe-* (for *bhavi-*)
Fut. bheṣyati SP 68.1; LV 48.13; Mv i.234.5, etc., common. The regular form (beside bhaviṣyati); = Pali hessati; apparently not in Pkt.

(4) stem *bhū-, hū-*. The aor. abhū(t) was inherited from Skt.; the other forms, notably the standard aor. abhūṣi, are doubtless based on it by proportional analogy, on such models as adā(t) : adāsi. The fut. -bhūṣyaṃ could be similarly explained
Fut. pratibhūṣyam (1 sg.; § 31.15) Mv ii.142.17
Root Aor. (Skt. abhūt, Pali ahū, ahu) and related forms: abhū SP 157.10; abhu SP 204.9; ahū Gv 254.23 (§ 32.107); abhūva (id.; 1 sg.) RP 25.15; abhūvatāṃ (3 dual) LV 83.13 (§ 32.109, q.v. for other, doubtful forms); abhūnsu(ḥ), abhūtsu(ḥ), abhunsu(ḥ), °ṃsu(ḥ), °tsu(ḥ), 3 pl., Mv i.41.7 etc. (§ 32.108)
s-Aor. abhūṣi (the regular form, very common; § 32.72) SP 26.13; LV 27.19; Mv i.3.13 etc.; abhūṣī SP 383.11; Gv 254.10; abhūṣīt Hoernle MR 133–5 (§ 32.72); abhūṣita Mv i.34.16 (§ 32.73)

(5) (*saṃ-, abhisaṃ-*)*-bhuṇa-ti*, attain; also *-bhuṇo-ti*: Pali id.; § 28.17; acc. to CPD 'formed after analogy of pū : punāti'; but since it is 'nearly synonymous with pāpuṇāti', as CPD also says, it seems clear that this, thematized as p(r)āpuṇati, is rather the source. Note domal ṇ (also in Pali pāpuṇāti); note also -bhuṇoti in one passage, which confirms my theory (Skt. prāpnoti); § 28.17
Pres. saṃbhuṇanti Mv ii.107.14; abhisaṃbh° Mv iii.334.9; opt. abhisaṃbhuṇema Mv iii.374.7, °ṇetha 12 abhisaṃbhuṇoti Mv iii.206.7–10 (four times)
Fut. saṃbhuṇiṣyasi Mv iii.264.14; abhisaṃbhuṇiṣyāmaḥ Mv iii.265.3
Ger. abhisaṃbhuṇitvā Mv iii.265.3 (so mss.; Senart em. °ṇitam)

(6) Caus. *bhāvaya-ti* (Skt.); also as non-caus.
Pres. opt. bhāvaye Mv iii.373.11; bhāvayī Samādh 8.30
Aor. bhāvaye Mv i.192.4 (developed, = expounded; Senart misunderstands); vibhāvayetsu(ḥ) Mv i.340.17
Ger. bhāvitva SP 92.8; bhāvayitvāna Mv ii.239.15; bhāviya (mss.) Mv i.357.18; in non-caus. mg. abhisaṃbhāvayitvā (§ 38.23), having attained (cf. abhisaṃ-bhuṇati, just above) Mv i.4.12

(7) Miscellaneous forms
Pres. bhavīti LV 325.5 (3 sg.); modelled on bravīti? or corrupt for bhavāti, m.c. for bhavati? Calc. glosses bhavati; Tib. implies this by its (mi gaṅ ḥdod pas bud med rnams kyi khol por) gyur pa (daṅ), 'what man because of desire becomes the slave of women', indicating a text kāmā (abl.) dāsu bhavīti (°vāti? two mss. °vati, unmetr.) yo naraḥ (so with v.l., metr. required) pramadānāṃ; prādurbhāmi, I appear, Gv 70.9 (prose); follows antardhāmi, I disappear, its antonym, and may be modelled on it; cf. Pali aor. pātur-ahaṃsu, appeared, also modelled on forms of antar(a)-dhā; but 2d ed. °bhavāmi (by em.?)
Aor. hī (= ahi = abhu?) LV 230.9 (§ 32.28); prādur-ahi Mv ii.221.17; iii.216.7 (§ 32.28)

bhṛ-: (1) *bhara-ti*, carry, hire (Skt.)
Ger. bharitvāna, carrying, Mv i.216.6
Caus. bharayitvā (§ 38.9), having caused to be hired, SP 105.11

(2) *bharaya-ti* (also *bhara-ti*?), fill: AMg. bharei, bharai; back-formation from Skt. bharita-, loaded, filled, which is a denom. pple. to bhara-, load; § 38.37
Aor. bharayetsuḥ Mv iii.427.16 (prose; so one ms.; v.l. bhavetsuḥ; Senart em. bharensuḥ)
Ger. bharitvā Mv i.231.5 (Senart em. °tva, m.c.); ii.295.9
Inf. bharayitum Mv iii.427.14 (prose; mss. hara°, cf. bharayetsuḥ, above, two lines later)

bhram-, wander: (1) *bhrama-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. bhrametsuḥ Mv i.222.7

(2) Caus. *bhrāmaya-ti* (Skt.)
Fut. udbhrāmiṣyase LV 334.17
Aor. bhrāmayiṃsū LV 81.7; bhrāmayetsuḥ Mv ii.415.1; bhrāmetsu Mv ii.342.22

matha-ti, shake (Skt.)
Ger. mathiya Mv i.72.16

mad-: *mādya-ti*, be exhilarated (Skt.); also *madya-ti*(?)
Pres. opt. pramadyeyā Mv ii.147.13. Blend of -madati and -mādyati? Or false Skt. for MIndic (Pali) pamajjati? Or error (misprint)?
Aor. pramādyi (2 sg.) Mv iii.124.18

man-, think: (1) *manya-te, -ti* (Skt.); also *-manyaya-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. abhimanyayāmaḥ LV 49.11; opt. manye LV 208.22; impv. manyāhi (v.l. manyahi) Mv ii.487.5
Fut. abhimanyiṣyati Mv ii.440.17
Aor. manyetsu (v.l. °suḥ) Mv i.302.4
Ppp. manyita- SP 63.3
Ger. avamanyitvā Mv i.309.11
Gdve. avamanyitavya- Śikṣ 108.2

(2) *mana-ti, manaya-te, mane-ti*: AMg. M. maṇai; §§ 28.17; 38.21
Pres. manesi Mv ii.249.3 (prose; v.l. manasi); manayase Bbh 226.9 (prose, which in this work rarely shows non-Skt. morphology; misprint for manyase? not noted in Glossary, but not corrected in Corr.)
Fut. maniṣyati, so Senart Mv i.239.15; 331.13; 333.15 (but see § 31.1)

(3) Caus. *mānaya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. pratimāne Mv iii.248.12; mānesi or mānayesi Mv i.60.1

(4) Desid. *mīmāṃsaya-ti*, non-caus. = Skt. mīmāṃsati; cf. Pali vīmaṃseti beside °sati

Pres. mīmāṃsaye (see § 38.21) Av i.94.3; opt. mīmāṃsayeyaṃ (so with mss.) Av i.189.4

mantraya-ti, announce (denom.; Skt.)
Aor. nimantrayī Mv i.113.4; āmantrayāsi Mv iii.204.2 (§ 32.59); °yasi (§ 32.62) Mv i.330.11; āmantresi Mv i.51.8; mantrayetsuḥ Mv i.344.1
Ger. āmantrayitvāna Mv ii.60.8
Caus. mantrāpayati Mmk 307.5

mamāya-te, -ti, cherish: Pali °ti (Skt. once °te in Mbh., see Dict.); denom. from mama
Pres. mamāyate Śikṣ 269.6; opt. mamāyeyur AsP 254.2; pple. mamāyamāna- Bimbisārasūtra (Waldschmidt Kl. Skt. Texte 4) 125.10
Inf. mamāyitum LV 100.9
Ppp. mamāyita- Dbh 39.23; Ud xxxii.18(17)

marga-ti, see *mārga-ti*

mā-, measure: (1) *(nir-, abhinir-)mimī-te* (Skt.), create by magic
Pres. (formally normal Skt.) nirmimīte SP 245.11; LV 290.20; abhinir° SP 189.3; LV 70.20; 293.2; Divy 166.6; opt. abhinirmimīyāt SP 188.1 (all these prose)
Ger. abhinirmāya (normal Skt.) LV 77.20 etc.; abhinirmimīya Bbh 152.2 (prose), § 35.14
Pass. abhinirmimīyantam (acc. sg. pres. pple.) Gv 444.15 (prose), being magically created, §§ 37.15, 37
(2) *(nir-, abhinir-)miṇo-ti* (Skt.), = prec. Not recorded in Pali; occurs here only in prose, cf. next
Pres. abhinirmiṇoti Divy 251.19; °miṇvanti LV 350.19; opt. nirmiṇuyām Divy 50.3
(3) *(abhinir-)miṇāti*, = prec.: Pali id.; not recorded in Skt. Here represented only by thematized forms (see next), except for the isolated ger.:
Ger. abhinirmiṇīya Mv ii.411.10 (§§ 28.16; 35.15)
(4) *(nir-, abhinir-)miṇa-ti*, = prec.: Pali id.; § 28.17
Pres. nirmiṇati Mv i.179.7 (mss. °miśati, em. Senart); opt. abhinirmiṇeyam SP 196.7, 9; in mg. exchange, nirmiṇeyā, and another (uncertain) form Mv ii.176.12, 14
Fut. abhinirmiṇiṣyanti Mv iii.288.2–12 (five times); °ṣyāmaḥ Mv iii.324.4
Aor. nirmiṇi LV 219.19; °ne Mv i.189.6; abhinirmiṇi Mv i.185.4; °ṇe Mv i.183.10; in Śikṣ 346.11, 16 text nirmaṇi, intending nirmiṇi
(Ppp. nirmita- and abhinirmita-, regular Skt., common)
Ger. nirmiṇitvā Mv iii.282.15; abhinirmiṇitvā SP 63.6; Mv ii.49.11; nirmiṇiya Mv i.366.10
(5) **-me-ti*; § 28.48
Inf. upametum SP 304.10 (§ 36.8)
(6) *māya-ti*: Pkt. māai, beside māi (Skt. māti); § 28.24
Pres. sammāyati Mv ii.173.12 (prose; so read with 1 ms.); opt. māyet AsP 157.19
(7) Caus. *māpaya-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. māpayitvāna Mv iii.45.2

mārga-ti, mārgaya-ti, hunt, seek (both Skt.); also *marga-ti*
Pres. margati, recorded several times in KP, e. g. 125.7; semi-MIndic for mārgati? (§ 3.34) or corruption?; mārgadhva Divy 374.12 (§ 30.18)
Pass. mārgīyanti Mv ii.167.12; mārgiyamāna- Mv ii.460.4

-miñjaya-ti, draw, jerk (or the like): Pali (saṃ)miñjeti (and °ati); see Dict. s.v. sammiñjayati
Pres. opt. saṃmiñjayet Mv i.55.1; Mmk 3.26; °jaye Mv iii.425.16
Ppp. saṃmiñjita- Mv i.55.1 etc.; also un-, ni-miñjita- (Dict.)

mille-ti, leave, abandon, reject: AMg. millai. Also *melleti*, q.v.
Pres. impv. millehi Mv i.363.14; iii.291.17 (here Senart em. mellehi)

mīlaya-ti, close (Skt.)
Aor. saṃmīlayesi Mv i.247.6

muc-, release: (1) *muñca-ti* (Skt.), also in passive mg., § 37.16
Pres. opt. muñceya Mv ii.331.1; impv. muñcāhi Mv ii.459.15; muñcahī LV 178.10
Aor. muñci LV 92.20; pramuñce Mv ii.340.10; muñciṣu LV 193.17; pramuñcitsuḥ Mv ii.4.9; muñcetsu Mv i.266.16
Ppp. muñcita- Suv 49.1
Ger. muñcitvā Mv ii.82.19; omuñciya Mv ii.72.20; omuñciyāna Mv ii.73.1; pramuñci Śikṣ 327.14
Caus. muñcāpayati Mmk 640.18; impv. muñcāpetha Mv iii.297.12
(2) *muñcaya-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21. Not recorded in Pali or Pkt.
Pres. pple. muñcayantaḥ Megh 308.13
Fut. muñcayiṣya (1 sg.) Sukh 8.16
(3) *muca-ti*: AMg. mucai, muyai, cf. Pischel 485; § 28.31
Pres. mucanti SP 85.8 (could be m.c. for muñc°)
(4) Pass. *mucya-te* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. mucyeyā Mv i.364.2
Aor. mucyiṣu Suv 39.4 (§ 32.122)
Inf. mucyitum Mv ii.223.13; adhimucyitum KP 139.9
(5) Caus. *mocaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. moce (1 sg. mid.) LV 219.4; opt. pramoceyam Mv i.42.17; moceya Suv 37.8; vimocayi (1 sg.) Suv 51.15; impv. mocehi SP 174.4
Fut. mociṣya RP 15.8 (§ 31.34)
Aor. mocaye Mv ii.187.5; parimocesi Mv iii.446.2
(6) Miscellanous forms
Perf. (§§ 33.2, 4) pramumocatur (3 dual) SP 460.2; pramumocu (3 pl.) SP 190.4; Samādh 8.23

muṇḍaya-ti, shave (denom.; Skt.)
Caus. ger. muṇḍāpayitvā Divy 261.15

mud-, rejoice: (1) *moda-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. anumodi SP 58.6; impv. anumodāhi Mv ii.98.6
Ger. pratimoditvā Mv ii.248.10; (anumodya Kv 29.15;) anumodi SP 351.12
(2) 'Caus.' *modaya-ti* (Skt.), here (and even in Skt.) hard to distinguish in mg. from the simplex (but pratisaṃmodayati seems oftener to have -aya-, Dict.)
Pres. pratisaṃmodate Gv 53.14; °dante Bhīk 26b.4, 5
Aor. anumodaye Mv iii.426.6
Ger. pratisaṃmoditvā Mv i.273.10 (Senart em. °etvā); ii.443.17; iii.450.20
Pass. impv. pramodyahi Mv i.275.9

muṣa-ti (Epic Skt.): Pali musati, which means steals, with 'eyes' or 'sight' as the object; correct PTSD; so also Skt. muṣ-, BR 5.836, last line; and AMg. musanta-, pres. pple.; § 28.37. Cf. also *mūṣati*
Fut. muṣiṣyāmaḥ Divy 94.5, 10, 27 (prose)
Inf. muṣitum Divy 94.29

muhya-ti, go astray (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vimuhye Bhad 19

mūrcha-ti, become stiff (Skt.), also *mūrchaya-ti*, both caus. (as in Skt.) and non-caus.

Ger. mūrchitvā Mv iii.167.6; saṃmūrchayitvā (non-caus.) LV 234.2
Pass. of caus. mūrchiyāmi Mv ii.428.1, I am made stiff

mūṣa-ti, steal = *muṣati*, q.v.: Pkt. mūsai (Sheth); § 28.36
Fut. mūṣiṣyate Divy 281.8 (prose)
Inf. mūṣitu-kāma- Divy 276.24 (prose)

mṛ-, die: (1) *mara-ti* = Pali id.; based on fut. mariṣyati, § 28.13 (not connected with alleged Vedic marati); also *mare-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. marati Mv ii.242.4; marāmi Mmk 704.15; maranti Mv i.253.6; 359.23; 360.3; 361.5; marenti (§ 38.21) Gv 213.20; opt. mareya Mv iii.158.10
Inf. maritu-kāma- Mv ii.83.2
Gdve. maritavya- Mv iii.354.7
(2) *mṛyya-ti, -te*, semi-MIndic for Skt. mriyate (§ 37.27)
Present °ti,°te Mv ii.79.4 ff.
(3) Caus. *māraya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. mārase Mv i.179.18 (§ 38.28)
Ger. māritvā Mv ii.248.5
Caus. mārāpemi Mv ii.247.3 (§ 38.57)

mṛj-: *mārja-ti*, wipe (Skt.)
Aor. anuparimārje Mv ii.282.6–7
Gdve. saṃmrāṣṭavya- (Skt. °mārṣṭ°) Av ii.154.3 f. (§ 34.21)

mṛd-: *marda-ti*, crush (Skt., chiefly epic)
Pres. impv. avamardāhi Mv iii.25.11
Fut. mardiṣyāmi Mv ii.270.4
Inf. avamardatum Divy 622.17 (§ 36.7)

mṛśa-ti, stroke (Skt.)
Pres. opt. parāmṛśe (1 sg.) Mv iii.8.7, 9
Fut. āmṛkṣyanti Śikṣ 45.12 (§ 31.25)
Aor. vimṛṣuḥ (for °śuḥ) LV 385.19 (§ 32.118)

mṛṣ-: *marṣaya-ti*, pardon, let pass (Skt.)
Pres. impv. marṣehi Mv iii.192.1

melle-ti, abandon, reject (= *milleti*): Pkt. mellei, mellai
Pres. impv. mellehi Mv ii.448.4; 454.16
Ger. mellitvā Mv ii.463.17; melletvā Mv ii.463.15

maitrāya-te, -ti (denom.), show love (from maitrā, Dict.)
Pres. maitrāyate Bbh 369.15; pple. °yatā (instr.) Divy 105.17; 123.7; °yamāṇa- AsP 395.12

mokṣaya-ti, free (Skt., denom.)
Pres. impv. mokṣehi Mv ii.179.4
Aor. mokṣaye Mv iii.13.12
Ger. vimokṣayi Mv i.72.14

mlāya-ti, fade (Skt.); also MIndic milā°: Pali milāyati
Pres. opt. saṃmilāyetsuḥ Mv ii.178.8
Fut. pass., in caus. mg. (§ 38.24), āmlāyiṣyase LV 335.5
Ppp. milāyita- Mv ii.232.3; āmilāta-, saṃmilāta- Mv ii.126.4, 5 (§ 34.11; Dict.)
Inf. mlāyitum Divy 570.25

yaja-ti, sacrifice (Skt.)
Pres. impv. yajāhi Mv ii.237.19
Fut. yajiṣyati Mv ii.98.7
Ppp. yajita- Kv 29.21; yaṣṭa- LV 170.12 etc. (the common form: § 34.13)
Ger. yajitvā Mv ii.237.20; °tvāna Mv ii.405.12

yat-, stretch: Caus. (*nir-*)*yātaya-ti, -te*, once perhaps -*yād°* (as in Pali): Pali niyyādeti
Pres. niryātayi (1 sg. mid.) SP 115.9
Aor. niryātayī Suv 152.10; niryātesi Mv i.49.16; niryādayinsuś, Kashgar rec. for SP 191.2
Ger. niryātetvā Mv i.63.2; °itvā Mv i.117.8

yam-, hold: (1) *yaccha-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. anuprayacchāhi Mv ii.146.11
Aor. prayacche (mss. praṇacche) Mv ii.268.11
Ppp. vyāyacchita- Bbh 92.16
Inf. anuprayacchituṃ Mv ii.147.2
(2) *yama-ti*; cited as 'E +' in Whitney, Roots, but very rare and irregular in Skt.; regular in Pali in all cpds. (Geiger 133); also AMg. saṃjamai, beside Pkt. jacchai (Sheth). Once vyāyāma-, see below
Pres. pple. vyāyamentena Mv i.246.4 (so Senart by em.); vyāyāmantena Mv ii.30.11 (same mg., exerting himself; not caus.; § 38.30; cf. Skt. vyāyāmya Manu 7.216, Jolly, without v.l., but Bombay ed. of 1886 vyāyamya, with several comms. Is the Mv reading also a corruption, or influenced by the noun vyāyāma?)
Ger. vyāyamitvā SP 109.5

yā-, go: (1) *yā-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. prayāsi (§ 32.53) Mv i.255.3; niryānsuḥ (°ṃsuḥ, 3 pl.) Mv iii.161.14 (§ 32.75); samayā (mss., for °yāt) Mv ii.315.10 (§ 32.106)
(2) *yāya-ti*: Pali id. (Geiger 138); § 28.24
Pres. opt. niryāyeyuḥ SP 78.12 (prose, no v.l.); pple. prayāyataḥ (gen. sg.) Mv iii.120.2; yāyena (mss., instr., = yāyatā; § 18.61) Mv i.232.6; prodyayāmāna, m.c. for prodyāyamānaḥ, §§ 3.31; 27.1, setting out, Dbh.g. 51(77).25
Ppp. yāyita- Mv i.299.8: read yāyitā, they have gone to . . ., with one ms. (v.l. yācitā; Senart wrongly em. jātā)

yāca-ti, beg (Skt.), also *yāce-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. indic. yācesi Mv ii.185.9; opt. yāci (mss., 2 sg.) Mv iii.419.5; yācesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.406.1; impv. yācāhi Mv i.289.6; yācehi Mv i.287.11; pple. yācintyāḥ (i for e, § 3.49; gen. sg. fem.) Mv i.133.1
Aor. yāci Mv i.132.11; yāce Mv ii.399.1; yācesi Mv iii.97.15
Pass. yācīyanti Mv iii.315.18

yuj-, join: (1) *yuñja-ti, -te* ('U.E.+', Whitney, Roots); once -*yuñjya-te* (?)
Pres. opt. prayuñji (see note) Śikṣ 343.2. In Divy 512.12 samanuyuñjyāmahe may be a textual error (or else a phonetic corruption) for °yuñjāmahe, or otherwise a 4th class pres. stem in -ya-, cf. below (2); § 28.26
Ger. an-anuyujitvā Mv iii.160.6, prob. misprint, or corruption, for °yuñjitvā, see § 35.28
(2) Pass. *yujya-te* (Skt.); also with active mg., or 4th class pres., § 28.28
Pres. opt. saṃyujyeyā (by em.) Mv i.295.18; with active mg., or 4th class pres. (cf. samanuyuñjyāmahe above) samanuyujyamāna- Prāt 482.4, 6; impv. yujyadhva RP 18.14 (§ 30.18); abhiyujyadhve SP 79.11 (§ 30.19)
Aor. saṃyujyiṣu Suv 39.5 (injunctive), § 32.122
(3) Caus. *yojaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. prayojeyyā Mv i.279.16
Aor. prayojayī (1 sg.) SP 90.5; udyojayi Mv i.322.7
Ger. udyojayitvāna Mv ii.320.3
Caus. yojāpayanti Mv iii.101.20; impv. °pehi Mv iii.441.20; Aor. °pesi Mv iii.442.2; Ger. °payitvā Mv i.259.8

? *yuṭ-*: udyoṭita-, ppp., see Dict.

-yūha-ti (with *ā-*, *nir-*, once *vi-*), exert oneself (or the like), MIndic: Pali āyūhati, saṃyūhati, AMg. ṇijjūh-. Perhaps historically related to Skt. vyūh-, cf. āvyūhati nirvyūhati MadhK 298.13; 517.20 (but these are doubtless secondary attempts at Sanskritization)
Pres. āyūhāmi niryūhāmi Gv 83.12; pple. instr. āyūhatā nīryūhatā Gv 69.24; gen. Gv 80.25; loc. fem. Gv 199.24; āyūhantī viyūhantī Gv 222.15
Pass. āyūhyamānaṃ nāyūhyate, niryūhyamānaṃ na niryūhyate Laṅk 115.13 f.

rakṣa-ti and *rakṣaya-ti*, protect (both Skt. but the latter very rare there)
Pres. opt. abhirakṣaye Mv iii.388.6; parirakṣeyā (2 sg.) Mv i.277.8; rakṣesi (2 sg.) Mv iii.387.7
Fut. pple. parirakṣisanto LV 47.10 (? § 31.28)
Pass. rakṣīyati Mv iii.298.11

raj-, be charmed: (1) *rajya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. rajyeyā Mv ii.147.13
(2) Caus. *rañjaya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. saṃrañjetsu(ḥ) Mv i.342.11

raṇa-ti, sound (Skt.)
Pres. opt. anuraṇe Mv ii.282.12
Aor. raṇī LV 236.10; raṇe Mv ii.342.7; raṇiṣū LV 222.7; raṇiṃṣū LV 233.18

rabha-ti, *-te*, take hold (Skt.)
Fut. ārabhiṣya (1 sg., so read, § 31.33) Sukh 8.17 (not ger. ārabhidhya, § 35.56)
Aor. samārabhe Mv ii.308.1
Ppp. ārabhita- SP 408.15
Inf. prārabhantum (! § 36.13) Mmk 74.16

ram-, rejoice: (1) *rama-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. ramimo LV 321.20 (§ 27.10); opt. rameyyā (v.l. °eyā) Mv ii.144.9; impv. ramāhi Mv ii.103.6; ramasu (? § 30.16) LV 328.9
Fut. ramiṣyati Mv ii.443.10
Aor. rametsu Mv i.194.17; °tsuḥ Mv ii.301.13
Ger. ramitvā Mv ii.111.16
Gdve. ramitavya- Mv ii.107.17
Caus. ramāpayate Mmk 571.20; impv. ramāpehi Mv ii.430.4
(2) Caus. *rāmaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. rāmehi Mv ii.430.4 (in same line with ramāpehi, above; they are obviously used as synonyms)

rahāya-ti, be hidden (denom.; Skt. Gr. °te): Pali id.
Pres. rahāyati Śikṣ 4.20 (vs; i could be m.c. for e)

rādhya-ti, succeed (Skt.)
Aor. aparādhyetsuḥ Mv ii.137.9; so mss., and prob. a form of this root is intended at ii.139.4, see Dict., and under root 1 vyadh (1)
Inf. aparādhyituṃ Mv iii.126.18; 127.2

riñca-ti, leave: Pali id.; § 28.4
Pres. riñcati Mvy 2552; Śikṣ 53.9; impv. riñcata LV 18.12, riñcatha (in version of the same incident) Mv i.197.1, 4; also i.357.4, 6
Fut. riñciṣyasi Bbh 396.20
Ppp. riñcita- SP 62.2; Divy 638.10; Mmk 73.9
Ger. riñcitvā KP 90.3; AsP 237.7; read so, probably, for ricitvā RP 34.12 (prose), despite Whitney Roots 'aricat C'
Gdve. riñcitavya- AsP 243.6

ritīya-te, see *ṛtī*°

ridhya-te, see *ṛdh*°

ru-: *rava-ti*, cry (rare in Skt.): Pali id.
Pres. oravanti Mv ii.100.17; impv. ravāhi Mv ii.462.18
Fut. viraviṣyati Divy 276.2
Aor. anuravi LV 164.22 (3 pl.; so read for text tatu ravi); raviṣu (or ravi su- with v.l.; ed. em. °ṣū) LV 167.12
Ppp. ravita- LV 286.14; Sūtrāl. comm. on xii.9

ruc-, shine: (1) *roca-ti*, *-te* (Skt.); here also in caus. mg., see (3) *rocayati*
Pres. opt. viroce Mv i.70.7
Aor. virociṣū LV 122.22
(2) *rucya-ti*, be pleasing, also *rucca-(ti)* with MIndic phonology: Pali ruccati; an analogical passive or 4th class pres. to Skt. ppp. rucita-, or to rocate which (with caus. pass. rocyate, rare) is used in the same mg. in Skt.
Pres. rucyati Mv ii.464.10; rucyanti SP 98.11; ruccati Mv ii.485.6
Ppp. ruccita- Mv ii.427.16
(3) Caus. *-rocaya-ti* (Skt.), here also *roca-ti* in caus. mg. (§ 38.28); conversely (*vi-*)*roce-ti* as non-caus.
Pres. virocenti (non-caus.) Mv i.78.12; rocanti (caus.) SP 306.4; abhirocante (caus.) Mv i.78.14; impv. ārocehi Mv i.287.10
Aor. ārocayasi (3 sg., § 32.62) Mv i.27.11–12; ārocesi (3 pl.) Mv i.257.15; ārocatesi (3 sg., § 32.68) Mv ii.169.9; ārocaye Mv ii.198.16 (v.l. °cate); ārocetsuḥ Mv i.258.2
Caus. ppp. ārocāpita- Mv i.307.13 .

rud-, weep: (1) *roda-ti* (Skt.), also *rodaya-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. rodayāmi Mv iii.351.9 (non-caus.; prose; in response to question: kiṃ rodasi?); impv. rodāhi Mv ii.218.13; rodahī (most mss. rodihi) LV 237.9
Aor. prarodi Mv ii.38.16; prarodī Mv ii.32.11; rodetsuḥ Mv ii.225.12
Ger. roditvā (once in Epic Skt., Mbh. Calc. 13.5410) Mv ii.189.15; 215.5
(2) *ruda-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. rudahi LV 231.10
(3) Miscellaneous forms
Perf. (intensive) roruroda Mmk 381.2 (§ 33.6)
Ppp. ruṇṇa- (= Pali and Pkt. id.; § 34.17) Mvy 6663; LV 195.2 (text rūṇṇa)

rudh-, hold back: (1) *rundha-ti* (Epic Skt.): Pali id.; § 28.4
Aor. uparundhi (1 sg.) Mv ii.124.10
Ger. orundhitvā Mv ii.75.10
(2) *-ruddha-ti*; § 28.19
Aor. uparuddhe (mss. u-ru°; 1 sg.) Mv ii.125.1 (Senart em. uparundhe)
Fut. viruddhiṣyati, will obstruct, Mv ii.490.15
(3) Caus. *rodhaya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. nirodhayī LV 236.5

(*ava-*)*rup-*, plant: only in ppp., planted, back-formation from avaropayati (Skt. and BHS), plants, caus. of (*ava-*)*ruh*, q.v.; see Dict. and § 34.11
Ppp. avarupta- Suv 91.8; Gv 278.22; Mv ii.314.11; orupta- Mv iii.104.18 etc.

ruṣ-, be angry: (1) *ruṣa-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. ruṣitvā RP 23.3
(2) Caus. *roṣaya-ti* (Skt.)
Fut. (pass.) roṣiṣyase LV 334.19

ruh- mount, grow, etc. (see also *ārūḍhayati*): (1) *roha-ti* (Skt.)

Aor. rohiṣu LV 75.20
Inf. abhirohaṇāya Divy 113.20
Caus. rohāpayati KP 30.1

(2) *ruha-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. āruheyā LV 80.10; āruhi Mv i.201.11 (1 sg.; or ger.? so read) = ii.5.6
Fut. āruhiṣyati Mv ii.90.12
Aor. āruhī LV 236.15
Ger. āruhitvā SP 128.12; abhiruhitvāna Mv iii.289.1; āruhiya Mv ii.90.7
Gdve. abhiruhitavya- Mmk 701.12
Caus. ger. abhiruhāpayitvā Mv iii.39.6

(3) *ruhya-ti*: not in Skt. and seems not recorded in Geiger or Pischel, but occurs in Pali: Jāt. iv.408.9 ruyhamānāni, growing (to aor. rūhiṃsu, just preceding)
Pres. ruhyati, heals, gets well, Mv i.5.9; viruhyati (mss. °nti; v.l. virūhyanti) Mv iii.405.11; pple. oruhyantaṃ Mv iii.34.6, 8, 10
Gdve. abhiruhyatavya- (read °hyitavya- ? § 34.21) Mmk 719.22

(4) Caus. *ropaya-ti* (Skt.). See also *-rup-*, plant (back-formation from this)
Pres. opt. āropaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.20.10
Aor. āropayi (3 pl.) SP 331.11
Caus. ropāpayasi Mv ii.486.6

(5) Caus. *-rūpaya-ti*, with ū for o (or u), § 3.55, as in Pali rūhati = rohati (ruhati), and Pali rūpeti, makes grow, Sn. comm. 142.24, 26; 143.14 (this = Skt. ropayati, and is a caus. to Pali rūhati; it has nothing to do with the noun rūpa as PTSD suggests)
Pres. orūpayanti (keśān), cut off, Mv i.169.14 (= Skt. and BHS avaropayanti); opt. abhinirūpayed Śikṣ 16.6 (= Pali °ropeti; see Dict.)
Ppp. ārūpita- Mv iii.68.19
Ger. ārūpayitvā Mv iii.169.20; 393.18; ārūpetvā Mv iii.160.7; ārūpitvā Mv iii.150.1; ārūpiya Mv i.352.20

(*vi-*)*rolaya-ti*, agitate: Pkt. virolai (Hem. 4.121), ppp. virolia-; Skt. viloḍayati
Ppp. virolita- Mvy 5339
Ger. virolayitvā Mmk 711.2

lakṣaya-ti, mark (Skt., denom.)
Aor. vilakṣayīta SP 193.9 (§§ 29.6; 32.105)

lagna-ti, stick; also (?) *lagga-ti*, *lagnaya-ti*, *lagne-ti*; § 28.19
Pres. lagnati Mv iii.148.2 (twice); laggati (text) or lagneti (v.l.) Mv ii.429.13; opt. lagneyaṃ (1 sg.) Mv iii.128.3; impv. lagnatha Mv iii.354.10
Fut. anulagniṣyati Mv iii.73.4; and in preceding line 3 (for Senart avalambiṣyati) mss. anulagnayiṣyanti, anulambiṣyanti; read anulagn(ay)iṣyati or °yanti
Ppp. vilagnita- Mv ii.266.13

laṅgh-, leap, jump over: (1) *laṅghaya-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. laṅghitvā Mv ii.75.11 (v.l. laṅghayitvā, which is read ii.75.2); laṅghiya Mv ii.40.21 (Senart °yā m.c.)

(2) *-laṅghya-ti*, nowhere recorded
Pres. vilaṅghyāmi Divy 593.8 (vs; for vilaṅghayāmi, which would not fit meter)

lajja-ti, be ashamed (Skt.)
Ger. lajji LV 329.13
Gdve. lajjitavya- (= Pali lajjitabba-) Ud xvi.4

lapa-ti, speak (Skt.); also *lapaya-ti*, *lape-ti*, the latter at least non-caus.
Pres. ālapeti (non-caus.) LV 236.2; opt. ālape saṃlapeyyāsi (both 2 sg.; § 29.38) Śikṣ 100.16
Fut. pass. with caus. mg. (§ 38.24) vilapiṣyase LV 335.3
Aor. alapī Laṅk 23.14; ālape Mv iii.386.15
Gdve. ālaptavya-, saṃlap°, MSV ii.188.11, 12 (§ 34.21)
Ger. ālapitvā Mv ii.42.11
Caus. (? see Dict.) lapayati (= Pali lapeti) Ud xxx.52; more likely non-caus., = lapati, § 38.21

labh-, take: (1) *labha-ti* (Skt.), also *labhe-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. labhenti Śikṣ 336.8; praty-alabhante Gv 50.13 (§ 32.10); opt. labhe Mv ii.365.8; labheya Mv ii.184.11
Fut. labhiṣyaṃ (1 sg.) Mv ii.274.7
Aor. labhi LV 53.4; alabhe Mv ii.166.4; pratilabhetsu Mv ii.343.11
Ppp. labhita- LV 327.12
Ger. labhitvā LV 38.2; labhiya Dbh.g. 8(344).15; labhiyāna SP 118.7

(2) Miscellaneous forms
(Fut. pratilapssase Gv 286.4, prob. misprint, see § 31.29)
Aor. lapsi SP 190.2 (? § 32.81); abhilabdha Mv ii.61.19 (? § 32.82)
Ger. labdhā Mv ii.334.2 ff. (? § 35.52)

lamb-, hang: (1) *lamba-te*, *-ti* (Skt.)
[Pres. impv. vilamba-he? LV 210.4; § 30.8]
Aor. vilambiṣṭhāḥ (2 sg.) LV 217.11 (§ 32.46)
Ger. adhyālambitva SP 253.5
Caus. opt. lambāvayet Sādh 170.20; Ger. lambāviya (mss.) Mv ii.172.14 (§ 38.69)

(2) *-lambya-te*, nowhere recorded
Pres. pple. avalambyamānā Mv i.220.8 = ii.22.9 (in the latter mss. agree on °mbya°; in the former they are corrupt but seem to point in the same direction)

lardaya-ti, load: Pkt. laddeuṃ, Hindi lādnā and other New Indic forms
Pres. pple. lardayantaṃ Divy 5.22
Ger. lardayitvā Divy 5.26; 334.19
Inf. lardayituṃ Divy 5.23

lal-, sport: (1) *lala-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. lalatsuḥ or lalaṃsu (mss.) Mv ii.162.5 (§ 32.76)

(2) Caus. *lālaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. lālati Mmk 35.5 (§ 38.28)
Ppp., as noun, lālayita- LV 374.7 (Dict.; § 34.8)

laṣ-, desire (Skt.)
Inf. abhilāṣāya Mv i.61.15 (? § 36.19)

likha-ti, write (Skt.)
Pres. opt. abhilikhe Mmk 63.25; likheya SP 229.6
Aor. ālikhinsu SP 51.6, Kashgar rec.
Gdve. abhilikhitavya- Mmk 45.6; 62.23
Caus. opt. likhāpayed SP 51.4; Ger. °payitvā Divy 547.6; Gdve. abhilikhāpayitavya- Mmk 68.9

lip-, smear: (1) *limpa-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. vilimpāhi Mv ii.103.13
Aor. vilimpetsu Mv iii.118.16

(2) **lipa-ti*: nowhere recorded; in KSS 24.93; 41.50 is recorded alipat, classed as aorist (cf. Pāṇ. 3.1.53 f.); on this our form may be based, § 28.12
Ger. anulipitvā Mv ii.173.6

(3) Pass. *lipya-te* (Skt.); *līpya-te*(?)
Pres. līpyase Gv 389.2, misprint or error for lipyase?
Aor. lipyatha Mv i.176.17 (3 pl., § 32.117)

lih-, lick: *leha-ti*: Pali id.; apparently blend of leḍhi and lihati (the latter also Skt. but based on 3 pl. lihanti), § 28.39
Pres. parilehati Mv iii.144.15
Aor. lehī LV 197.1 (so with v.l., text lekhī), § 32.23

Ger. parilehiya Mv ii.194.5 (so em. Senart, certainly rightly)

1 *lī-*, cling, lie (see also *allīyati*): (1) *līya-te, -ti* (Skt.)
Pres. (? or Precative) opt. pravilīya (so for text °yu) LV 330.19 (§ 29.42)
Inf. pratilīyatu-kāma- (so mss.; § 36.7) Mv iii.428.10; pratisaṃlātu-kāma- MSV ii.128.5 (§ 36.11)
Gdve. avalīyitavya- ŚsP 1456.18
(2) **-laya-ti* (Gr., and layate 'V.B.', Whitney, Roots); and cf. next
Fut. pratisaṃlayiṣyāmi Mv iii.428.15
Aor. vilayensu (v.l. °tsu) Mv ii.282.15
(3) Miscellaneous (probably phonetic equivalent to preceding)
Fut. (leṣyati, Skt. Gr.) avaleṣyate, saṃleṣyate AsP 139.17, 18; °ṣyante id. 209.3

2 *lī-*, fly (= Skt. and BHS *ḍī-*): *-līya-ti*, cf. Pali Gr. ḷī- (and ḍī-), PTSD s.v. ḍeti
Pres. olīyanti Mv i.216.5; pralīyanti Mv i.216.11 = ii.19.8, also ii.19.2 (= i.216.5); Senart em. praḍī° in ii.19.2, 8, keeping -līyanti in i.216.5, 11
Aor. (§ 32.117) abhilīyathā (mss.) Mv ii.21.5; nilīyathā (mss.) Mv i.219.3

lu-, *lū-*, cut, reap: (1) *lūnā-ti* (= Skt. lunāti)
[Pres. lūnāti LV 286.4 (? see Dict.)]
(2) **lava-ti*: Pkt. lavai; Pali *lavati implied by caus. lavāpeti
Caus. Gdve. lavāpayitavya-, to be caused to be reaped, Mv iii.178.4

luj-, break (= Skt. ruj-): *lujya-te, lujja-te* (and *-ti*) is broken = Pali lujjati, Skt. rujyate
Pres. lujyate Mvy 3061; vilujyati Mv ii.423.13 (so read, see Senart's note); lujyante, pralu° AsP 256.7, 8; pple. pralujjaṃ Mv ii.354.13 (so read for text puluvaṃ) and perhaps iii.278.17 (or here pralujyanto, °yato?); lujjanti or lujyanti (loc. sg.) Mv ii.371.3 (mss.), also (mss.) pra-lu° Mv ii.370.22; lujyamāna- or lujja°, -or pra-lu° (various forms) Mv ii.356.9; 371.4, 13, 17, etc.; 373.4; Śikṣ 17.3
Aor. lujje, pralujje Mv ii.412.11, 12
Ppp. lugna-pralugna- Mv ii.429.18

luḍa-ti, stir (Skt. Gr., = lulati): Pali luḷ- and luṭ-
Pres. luḍanti LV 308.4
Ppp. luḍita- Mvy 6819; Gv 202.21; a-l° LV 181.12; a-saṃluḍita- Gv 402.14

lup-, break (Skt.)
Fut. vilopsyase LV 334.11 (lopsyati, -te, Skt. Gr.); § 31.23

lubh-, desire: Caus. *lobhaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. lobhehi Mv iii.291.2
Aor. lobhaye (3 pl.) Mv ii.425.6; lobhe (so read; mss. loke; 3 pl.) Mv iii.1.9
Ger. upalobhetvāna Mv iii.294.15

lokaya-ti, regard (Skt.)
Pres. impv. avalokayāhi Mv ii.164.8
Aor. avalokayi Mv i.157.12; vilokaye Mv i.305.17; vilokesi (mss.) Mv ii.281.3; vītiloketsuḥ Mv ii.125.14
Ger. avalokiya Mv ii.164.12
Inf. vyavalokayatum Divy 179.17 (§ 36.7)

lolaya-ti, agitate (Skt.)
Pass. lolīyanti Mv ii.167.12

vac-, speak: (1) *vaca-ti*: based on Pali aor. avaca, and chiefly limited to aor. forms. Geiger does not explain avaca; it seems to me clearly a blend-form, based primarily on avocat, with root-vowel by influence of forms in vac-; § 28.12
Pres. opt. vaced SP 258.4
Aor. avaci LV 135.1 (§ 32.24); avacī LV 109.16 (id.); avaciṃ (mss.; 3 pl.; § 32.39) Mv i.247.4; avaciṃsu (§ 32.38) SP 192.10; avaca (§ 32.113) Mv i.143.11 etc.; avacatetsuḥ Mv i.306.15 (§ 32.99); avacasi (3 sg., § 32.62) Mv iii.386.11; avacati (mss.; § 32.113) Mv ii.71.5; avacaṃsu Mv ii.233.17 (§ 32.76); avāca (? § 32.113) Mv ii.330.5
Perf. uvācat (§ 33.10) Mv iii.337.13; ovācu (§ 3.71) Gv 212.16 (ending of 3 pl.)
(2) Aor. Skt. *avocat*
Aor. avoca Mv ii.37.12 (§ 32.114); avocuḥ, see § 32.118
(3) Pass. *uccati* (cf. next), rare
Pres. uccati (v.l. ucyati) Mv ii.101.2
(4) Pass. *vucca-ti, -te*, etc. (MIndic; Skt. ucyate); see § 2.51
(5) Caus. *vācaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vācet SP 342.4 (§ 38.27)

vad-, speak: (1) *vada-ti* (Skt.); but most forms could be derived from *vade-ti*, below
Pres. opt. vade (2 sg.) SP 116.4; vadi SP 98.7; vadeya SP 229.10; vadeyya (or °yā) Mv ii.233.13, 18; vadesi (2 sg.) SP 93.11; 98.4, etc.; impv. vadāhi Laṅk 200.13; vadahi LV 56.11
Aor. vadetsu (v.l. vadansuḥ) Mv i.307.6 (§ 32.102)
Ger. vaditvāna Mv iii.328.12
(2) *vade-ti, vadaya-ti*: Pali vadeti (see also under prec.); § 38.21
Pres. vadeti SP 197.4; vademi SP 59.2; LV 335.15; Mv i.8.14 (prose; in same context vadāmi i.30.14); vadenti Mv i.256.11; vadayati Mv ii.237.18; impv. vadehi Mv i.324.10
(3) Caus. *vādaya-ti* (Skt.), *vāde-ti, vādati* (§ 38.28), 'play (instruments)' etc.
Pres. [vivādenti Mv i.10.12, but see § 38.23] vādataḥ (dual) MSV iii.16.6; impv. abhivādehi Mv iii.174.9
Aor. vādiṣu LV 75.13; pravādayatsu Suv 8.8 (mss.), § 32.76
Pass. aor. saṃpravādyi (3 pl.) Mv ii.328.2; vādyiṣu LV 194.2; vādyensuḥ Mv ii.303.17; saṃpravādyansu (v.l. °yetsu; mss.) Mv iii.96.13 (§ 32.102); saṃpravādyetsuḥ Mv ii.160.19
Caus. vādāpayataḥ (dual) MSV iii.16.7; Ppp. vādāpita- SP 51.11; 52.1; Ger. vādāpiya SP 52.4
(4) Miscellaneous forms
[Pres. (Prec.?) opt. vadyād LV 444.2 (§ 29.44)?]
['Pass.' (apparent) vadyase Mv ii.58.8 (here mss. vād°); 59.10; so interpreted by Senart, but really false Skt. for MIndic (Pali) vajjasi = Skt. varjyase, you are rejected, shunned (Dict.)]

vadh-, also (MIndic) *vah-*, slay: *vadha-ti*: Pali id.; no pres. in normal Skt.; § 28.14
Pres. impv. vadhatha Mv ii.282.3 (? mss. vadha, bandhatha)
Fut. vahiṣyāma (so read) Mv i.17.2
Ger. vadhitvā Mv iii.78.5; °tvāna Mv ii.236.6

vadhraya-ti, castrate, denom. to vadhri-
Pres. vadhrayanti Mv i.96.8

vanda-te, greet (Skt.), also *vande-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Pres. vandenti Mv i.256.10; vandima LV 364.6 (§ 27.10)
Aor. abhivandiṣu LV 116.4
Ger. vandiya (mss.) Mv iii.93.8
Inf. vandanāya SP 425.3

Caus. Fut. vandāpayiṣyāmo Mv ii.26.6; Aor. °payetsuḥ Mv i.223.13

vap, sow, scatter (Skt.)
Ppp. vutta (§§ 2.10, 53) Mv iii.360.14

varṇaya-ti, describe (denom., Skt.), also *varṇa-ti* (§ 38.28)
Pres. varṇanti LV 29.12
Aor. saṃvarṇaye Mv i.299.17

vardh-, cut (Skt. Dhātup. vardhayati)
Caus. vardhāpayata MSV i.119.14 (§ 38.55)

1 *vas-*, dwell: (1) *vasa-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. saṃvaseyā Mv ii.67.5; impv. vasāhi LV 241.18
Fut. adhyāvasiṣyasi (Epic Skt.) Mv ii.159.2; vasiṣyaṃ Mv ii.463.2
Aor. adhyāvasi Mv i.193.20; vipravasetsu(ḥ) Mv i.343.1–2
Ppp. vasita- LV 364.3
Ger. vasitvā Mv ii.462.18; °tvāna Mv iii.15.19
(2) *vasaya-ti*, *vase-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Pres. vasayāmi Divy 212.4, 6; impv. āvasehi Mv ii.405.9; vasayathā LV 202.5
(3) **-uṣa-ti*, in *upoṣa-ti*, keep (Sabbath) = Pali upavasati, and really only a phonetic Middle-Indicism for that form, with o for ava
Pres. (upoṣadham) upoṣati Mv ii.177.20
? Gdve. upoṣaṇīya-(prabha-) Sukh 29.14, Dict.
(4) Caus. *vāsaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. adhivāsehi Mv ii.272.2
Fut. adhivāsiṣyāma SP 271.10
Aor. adhivāsayī Suv 149.11; adhivāsesi Mv i.329.8; vipravāsayet Mv iii.44.22
(5) Semi-MIndic ppp. vusta, etc., see §§ 2.54, 62; 34.11; and perhaps ger. vustā, § 35.52

2 *vas-*, clothe (Skt.)
Ppp. nivasta- (= Pali nivattha-) LV 157.21 etc. (§ 34.11)

vasya-ti, cry: § 3.34 and Dict.
Pres. vasyati (mss.) Mv ii.450.8

1 *vah-*, carry; intrans. move: (1) *vaha-ti* (Skt.); most of the forms could go with *vaheti*, see next
Pres. opt. āvahe Mv ii.176.5; pravaheya Mv iii.358.3; impv. vahahi LV 237.1
Aor. udvahetsuḥ (so with mss.; intrans.) Mv ii.39.5
Ger. vahitvā (mss. vāh°) Mv ii.434.9
Inf. udvahituṃ Mv iii.252.16
(2) *vahe-ti*, non-caus. (cf. under prec.), § 38.21
Pres. vaheti Mv ii.228.1
Fut. vaheṣyaṃ Mv ii.236.13
(3) *vahya-ti*, flow (intrans.); in this sense Skt. may use vahati, vahate, and pass. uhyate; is this a blend of these, or a passive irregularly formed on vah- instead of uh-? Or merely a 4th Class present, as often in other roots (§ 28.28)? Cf. § 37.20
Pres. vahyanti LV 398.6 (prose)
(4) Caus. *vāhaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres., non-caus. (§ 38.23), prativāhayāmi Gv 122.8
Pass. pravāhīyanti Mv iii.405.2; ovāhiyati Mv ii.274.16
(5) Pass. vuhyati (= uhyate), etc., see § 2.52
(6) Miscellaneous
Participle vyūḍha-māna RP 55.1 (§ 34.1)
Inf. voḍhū (? §§ 3.3; 36.5) KP 82.9 (vs)

2 *vah-*, see *vadh-*

1 *vā-*, weave: (1) **vāya-ti*, for Skt. vayati; aside from the caus. (below), only in Ppp. vāyita- (= Pali id.) Divy 276.11, and em. vāyitum (? see 2). Geiger 196 seems to regard this form (he alleges also an equivalent vāta-, not recorded in the dictionaries, but quotes no passage) as based on a pres. pass. *vāyate, but I find no record of such a form. See §§ 28.24, 33
Caus. vāpayanti Divy 213.10; Fut. vāpayiṣyante Divy 213.11; Inf. vāpayitum Divy 213.8
(2) *vayati* (Skt.)
Inf. vayitum MSV i.82.14 (= Divy 83.23 em. vāyitum, mss. vāsitum)
(3) Miscellaneous
Pass. pple. uyamāna- Mvy 8410, see Dict. s.v. uyate

2 *vā-*, blow: (1) *vāya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. nirvāyi Mv ii.375.8; vāyeyā Mv iii.317.7
Fut. vāyiṣyanti Mv ii.308.8
Aor. parinirvāyi (? mss. °ya) Mv i.304.11; vāye (3 pl.) Mv ii.352.14; parinirvāyet Mv i.267.18; nirvāyetsu(ḥ) Mv ii.23.2
(2) *vā-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. nirvāsu, nirvāṃsu (3 pl.) Mv i.197.6 = 357.8 (§ 32.75)
(3) Caus. *vāpaya-ti* (Skt.); *vāpe-ti*; also as non-caus. (§ 38.58)
Pres. impv. nirvāpehi Mv iii.390.11
In non-caus. mg.: opt. parinirvāpayeyaṃ Divy 90.10
Inf. parinirvāpayitu-kāma- SP 250.12 (mss., except two °vātu-; KN em. °vāyitu-)

vāhaya-ti, see *bāh°*, and *vah-* (4)

vij-, shake: (1) *vija-ti* (Skt.)
Ppp. saṃvijita- Ud xix.1
(2) Caus. *vejaya-ti* (Skt.)
Ger. udvejetvāna Mv iii.77.8

**vijaṭaya-ti*, untangle, card (wool): Pali vijaṭeti; denom. from vijaṭa-
Caus. opt. vijaṭāpayed Prāt 498.1

viṭṭāle-ti, make impure: Pkt. (Deśī) id.; in Pañc. Rec. 2 § 130 read viṭṭālitāḥ, as noted in Add. and Corr.
Pres. viṭṭāleti Mv iii.126.16

1 *vid-*, know: (1) *vida-ti*, § 28.7
Pres. vidāmy Gv 340.9; vidasi Gv 316.21
Ger. viditvāna Mv iii.71.6; 83.18
(2) Caus. *vedaya-ti* (Skt.), also *veda-ti*
Pres. vedati (§ 38.28) Av i.243.12; opt. nivedaye Mv ii.37.12; impv. prativedehi Mv iii.2.5
Ppp. vedayita- (§ 34.8) LV 420.3
Ger. veditvāna (mss.) Mv iii.61.11
(3) Miscellaneous
Pres. 2 pl. vettha LV 125.7 (? § 28.60)

2 *vid-*, find: (1) *vinda-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vindeyā LV 201.22; impv. vindahi (? text vandahi) Gv 485.22; 487.2 (here 2d ed. vi°)
Ger. vinditvā Mv ii.67.6; vindi (?) Gv 485.23; 487.10 (§ 35.51)
Caus. vindayantī or °nti (§ 38.9) LV 242.7
(2) *vida-ti* ?
Pres. vidanti SP 305.11 (§ 28.31)
(3) Pass. *vidya-te* (Skt.), and *-vidyaya-te*, non-caus.
Pres. saṃvidyayante LV 115.9 (§§ 37.21; 38.18, 21); opt. vidyetsuḥ Mv i.273.2
(4) (Caus.? denom.?) *-veda(ya)-ti* ?
Ger. nirveditvā Mv ii.198.1 (prose), becoming disgusted; denom. from nirveda-? Form uncertain; v.l. nirviṇitvā; read nirvinditvā? Pali pres. nibbindati, but

also opt. nibbide, v.l. °je (Jāt. v.368.8; comm. nibbindeyya), and ger. nibbijjitvā, implying nibbijjate = Skt. nirvidyate; Pkt. only ṇivvijjai (apparently)

vip-: *vepa-ti*, *-te*, tremble (Skt.)
Ger. vepitvā Mv ii.42.11

virāgaya-ti, be averse, offend (denom.; rare in Skt.); for regular Skt. forms see Dict.
Pres. opt. virāgayi (1 sg.) Bhad 24

vilomaya-ti, go contrary to (denom.; Skt. ppp. *vilomita-*), also *viloma-ti*
Pres. vilomayanti Gv 493.3; pple. a-vilomayan Dbh 47.18; a-vilomanta (read °mata, m.c.; n. pl. m.) Dbh.g. 27(53).3 (§ 38.30)

viś-, enter: (1) *viśa-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. praviśāhi Mv iii.25.8
Fut. praviśiṣyati Mv i.360.4
Aor. upāviśi Mv ii.199.9; praviśitsuḥ (mss. °ṣitsuḥ, pravarṣetsuḥ) Mv i.200.12; praviśāsi Mv iii.390.10 (§ 32.59); praviśet Mv i.307.16; praviśetsuḥ Mv i.151.15
Ger. praviśitvā SP 236.7; praviśiya Mv i.361.5
Inf. praviśitum Mv iii.151.8; praviśatu LV 393.5 (§ 36.7)
Caus. impv. saṃviśāpehi Mv ii.430.6; Ppp. upaviśāpita- Mv ii.103.4; Ger. upaviśāpayitvā Mv ii.479.10
(2) *-viśya-ti*: Pali pavissāmi, occurs twice, interpreted by Geiger 65.2 as haplological for pavisissāmi. But it can quite as well represent praviśyāmi, as here
Pres. praviśyāmi Mv ii.492.19; praviśyanti Divy 196.20 (both prose)
(3) Caus. *veśaya-ti* (Skt.), here sometimes in non-caus. mg.
Pres. opt. vipraveśeyā Mv ii.146.14; niveśeyyā Mv i.53.6 (mss.); impv. saṃveśehi Mv ii.431.11, substituted for saṃviśāpehi (above, 1) in same phrase
Aor. niveśaye Mv i.312.12; (non-caus., § 38.23) niveśayi (3 pl.) LV 158.13; praveśi Mv iii.162.5
Ger. praveśi (non-caus.) LV 243.11
Pass. praveśīyati Mv i.223.10; pple. praveśīyantehi Mv iii.127.12; Ger. praveśīya (§ 35.17) Mv iii.16.3
(4) Miscellaneous forms
Aor. pravekṣī LV 136.6 (§ 32.80)
Ppp. with -māna-: praviṣṭamāna- (§ 34.1) LV 7.2
Inf. anupraviṣṭum (§ 36.9) Mmk 94.1

viṣ-: (1) (*pari-*)*viṣa-ti*, serve = Pali id.; in Cl. Skt. only pariveṣayati (Epic rarely °veṣati), in same mg., and pass. °viṣyate; is °viṣati a back-formation from one of these forms? For ṣ, both s and ś are written in mss. (and sometimes printed by Senart in Mv)
Pres. pariviṣati Mv ii.211.17 (so read; Senart praticarati, em.); 276.9; iii.145.10; opt. °viṣeyam Mv ii.276.6
Fut. pariviṣiṣyāmaḥ Mv ii.275.12
Ger. pariviṣitvā Mv iii.130.12; 145.12
Pass. pariviṣīyati Mv ii.276.4
Caus. Ppp. pariviṣāpita- Mv ii.439.4
(2) (*pari-*)*veṣaya-ti*, serve (Skt.; cf. above)
Caus. Fut. pariveṣāpayiṣyam (1 sg.; text with mss. °veś°) Mv ii.435.11

*(*ni-*)*vuṭṭa-ti*, sink down; MIndic form (§§ 2.11; 3.57) of nivartati; cf. nivarteti Mv ii.172.4, just before these forms
Ger. nivuṭṭiya Mv ii.172.6
Caus. Ger. nivuṭṭāpiya Mv ii.172.7

1 *vṛ-*, cover: (1) *-vṛṇī-te*, 9th class (§ 28.16)
Pres. impv. vivṛṇīṣva LV 398.17
(2) *-vara-ti*: Pali id. (as vi-, saṃ-varati); cf. § 28.13
Pres. prāvaranti SP 11.12; Divy 216.3 (but 215.29 prāvṛṇvanti); vivarāmo SP 110.1; vivarāmi Gv 67.3 (prose); impv. prāvaritu (§ 27.10) Divy 215.29; prāvaradhvam Divy 216.4; pple. vivaran LV 414.22 (so with v.l. °raṃ for text vicaraṃ: disclosing = bestowing treasures)
Aor. vivarī LV 236.17; vivaretsu(ḥ) Mv iii.262.6
Ppp. vivarita- LV 233.3
Ger. prāvaritvā SP 114.5; Suv 69.12; vivaritvā SP 176.11; prāvariya Mv ii.441.14; prāvariyāṇa SP 272.3
Gdve. āvaritavya- Mv iii.55.6; prāvaritavya- MSV ii.68.9
Caus. pple. prāvarayantyā Bhīk 11a.5 (§ 38.9)
(3) *-vura-ti*, cf. Pali (apā-)purati; for apā-varati (cf. prec.) with u for a after labial consonant, § 3.57, cf. Geiger 19.2; but I think Geiger wrong in suggesting that the position of the accent is concerned. I doubt that the form is old as implied by CPD s.v. apāpurati (with reference to Wackernagel I § 21)
Pass. apāvurīyati (Dict.) Mv ii.158.1
(4) Caus. *vāraya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. saṃpravārayi Mv iii.257.10; °rayet Mv i.325.11; parivārensu(ḥ) Mv ii.225.10 (§ 32.102)
Ger. pravāritvā Mv ii.489.10 (prose), having clothed (another); parivāria (§ 35.38) Śikṣ 343.18
Pass. vārīyati Mv ii.493.1; pple. vāriyanto (v.l. vārī°) Mv ii.274.1; nivārīyantī (n. sg. fem.) Mv ii.174.12
(5) Miscellaneous forms
Pres. impv. apāvṛṇohī SP 191.10; prāvṛṇothā LV 80.2 (§ 28.62)
Inf. vivṛtuṃ LV 46.7 (§ 36.9)

2 *vṛ-* choose: (1) 'Caus.' *varaya-ti* (Skt.; usually indistinguishable from simplex in mg.)
Pres. impv. varehi Mv ii.70.4
(2) *vāraya-ti*, hand out, present; in this sense app. unrecorded; Pali and Epic Skt. have the form in mg. choose = varayati, vṛṇīte; may be denom. to Skt. vāra, see Dict.
Pres. vāreti (v.l. vārayati; Dict.) Mv ii.442.2
Caus. opt. vārāpeya KP 158.3 (text corrupt); *159.7*

vṛj-: *varjaya-ti*, avoid (Skt.)
Pres. opt. varjeya (mss.) Mv ii.299.15
Fut. vivarjiṣyase LV 333.14
Aor. vivarjayi (3 pl.) LV 158.13; parivarjaye (v.l. °varje; 1 sg.) Mv ii.131.7
Ger. vivarjitva SP 99.4; parivarjitvā Mv i.12.14

vṛt-, turn [see also (*ni-*)*vuṭṭ-*]: (1) *varta-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. pravarti LV 48.11; impv. nivartāhi Mv i.270.14
Aor. parivartiṣu LV 173.16; vartīsu LV 402.14; pravartitha (3 pl., § 32.42) Mv i.13.16; vivartetsu(ḥ) Mv i.80.1; vartesi Mv i.268.17
Ppp. pratinivartita- Mv iii.102.19 (intrans.)
Ger. nivartitvā Mv iii.102.18
Inf. nivartanāya Dbh.g. 17(353).9; vartanatāyai Bhad 10 (§ 36.17)
Caus. impv. pratinivartāpaya (tu, separate word) Divy 346.10; Inf. nivartāpayituṃ Mmk 86.3
(2) Caus. *vartaya-ti* (Skt.), *varte-ti*, also in non-caus. mg. (§ 38.21)
Pres. opt. pravarteyam Mv i.330.4; parivarteya Mv iii.32.2; nivartaye (2 sg.) Mv i.75.19; impv. nivartehi Mv ii.151.8; pravartayahī LV 414.22; (non-caus.) nivartayatha LV 228.8; nivartehi Mv ii.105.8; nivartayasva LV 225.12
Aor. (a)vartayī LV 220.22; pravartayi (1 sg.) Gv 231.18; pravartayinsu Hoernle MR 134 for SP 327.11; vinivartayet Mv ii.61.21

vṛdh-, grow: (1) *vardha-ti* (Skt.); also MIndic *vaddh-* for *vardh-*
Fut. abhivardhiṣyanti Mv i.332.13
Caus. Aor. vardhāpaye Mv ii.38.1; Ppp. vaddhāpita- (mss.) Mv i.287.16; Ger. vardhāpayitvā Mv i.310.2; vaddhāpayitvā Mv ii.421.11; vaddhāpetvā (mss.) Mv i.289.8
(2) Caus. *vardhaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vardhayi (2 sg.) Gv 488.14; impv. abhivardhehi Mv iii.168.1
Aor. vivardhayī (3 pl.) SP 131.1
Pass. saṃvardhīyati Mv iii.390.3; 405.9; vardhīyanti Mv i.274.2; ii.433.14; pple. saṃvardhiyamāna- (v.l. °dhī°) Mv ii.423.14

vṛṣ-, rain: (1) *varṣa-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. varṣahī LV 171.4
Aor. abhivarṣi LV 301.6; pravarṣī (3 pl.) LV 285.6; varṣiṣu LV 222.7; prāvarṣu (3 pl.; § 32.74) Suv 8.8; pravarṣe Mv ii.339.2; pravarṣetsuḥ (one ms.) Mv i.200.12
Ger. varṣitva LV 117.11; varṣi LV 294.5; pravarṣi Mv ii.413.17 (mss.)
Caus. varṣāpayati Mmk 464.1
(2) *vṛṣya-te* (§ 28.26)
Pres. (devo) vṛṣyate, rains, Divy 71.5 (prose)

vṛṣṭāyate, rains (denom. to Skt. vṛṣṭa or vṛṣṭi)
Pres. pple. °yamāne MSV i.36.8
Ppp. vṛṣṭita LV 283.10

1 (*ā-*)*vṛh-*, = *bṛh-*, q.v., tear: (*ā-*)*vṛṃha-ti* (§ 28.32)
Pres. pple. āvṛṃhato Mv i.13.2 (see Dict.)
Ppp. āvṛṃhita- Mv i.18.12 (prose)

2 (*ā-*)*vṛh-*, *bṛh-*, *brah-*, free, restore (a penalized monk); blended with prec., see Dict. s.v. ābṛhati: (1) *ābṛha-ti* (**ābraha-ti?*)
Pres. ābṛhyāt Prāt 488.2
Ppp. ābṛhita- Prāt 488.3
Gdve. ābrahitavya- Prāt 488.1
(2) *āvarha-ti*
Pres. opt. āvarhet MSV iii.53.10; impv. °hata 49.11; °hatu 51.9
Ppp. āvarhita- ib. 57.4; 58.18
Gdve. āvarhitavya- ib. 49.17
Inf. āvarhitum ib. 57.2
(3) Miscellaneous
Ppp. āvrīḍha- (as ābrīḍha- to ā-bṛh-) MSV iii.74.6 etc.

veṭh-, wrap: *veṭhe-ti-*, *veṭhaya-ti* = Pali id.; MIndic for Skt. 1 *veṣṭ-*, q.v., § 2.12
Pres. impv. veṭhetha (mss. veḍ°) Mv ii.451.9
Ppp. veṭhita- Mv ii.82.14
Ger. veṭhitvā Mv ii.173.6; veṭhayitvā Mv iii.390.8; veṭhiyāna Mv ii.485.14
Gdve. nirveṭhayitavya- Bhīk 16a.2
Caus. impv. prativeṭhāpehi Mv ii.171.12; Ppp. veṭhāpita- Mv ii.171.15

vedha-ti, also *vedhaya-ti* (non-caus.), § 38.21, shake, tremble: Pali vedhati; MIndic from vyath-, with Prakritic voicing of th, § 2.28; on e cf. § 3.116. See also 2 *vyadh-*
Pres. vedhati saṃpravedhati Divy 479.11, 12; pple. a-vedhamāna- SP 24.15; pravedhayamāna- (so with best mss.) LV 188.3
Imperf. avedhat prāvedhat saṃprāvedhat LV 352.2; 411.1; avedhanta prāvedhanta saṃprāvedhanta Dbh 98.31
Aor. vedhe saṃpravedhe Mv iii.334.2; 341.5
Ppp. vedhita-, pravedhita-, saṃpravedhita- Mvy 3007–9; Samādh 19.6

vell-, shake: Caus. *vellaya-ti* (simplex once in Skt. in mg. knead; not recorded in Pali or Pkt.)
Fut. parivellayiṣyanti AsP 215.13

1 *veṣṭ-*, wrap (see also *veṭh-*): *veṣṭaya-ti* (Skt.)
Caus. impv. niveṣṭāvehi Mv i.273.14 (so read, § 38.70)

2 *veṣṭ-*, labor; caus. *veṣṭe-ti*, supervise, keep working (servants and domestic animals); to denom. from veṣṭi- (Dict.) = Skt. viṣṭi-, forced labor
Gdve. veṣṭetavya- (§ 34.21) Mv iii.177.16, to be supervised
Caus. gdve. veṣṭāpayitavya- Mv iii.178.1, to be caused to be supervised

1 *vyadh-*, pierce: (1) *vijjha-ti* = Pali id., MIndic for Skt. vidhyati, § 2.14
(Aor. apavijhinsuḥ Mv ii.139.4; so Senart; mss. apari-jhiṃsuḥ; in ii.137.9 Senart reads apavidhyinsuḥ, to Skt. apavidhyati, but mss. aparādhyetsuḥ. Form and mg. both dubious; see under root *rādh-*)
Ppp. vijjhita- Mv i.22.5
Ger. vijjhitvā Mv iii.456.11 (= viddhitvā i.12.5); apa-vijjhiyāna Mv ii.104.4
(2) **viddha-ti*; if correct, denom. to ppp. viddha-, § 28.19; see § 35.28
Ger. viddhitvā Mv i.12.5 (= vijjhitvā Mv iii.456.11)
(3) *vindha-ti*, *vindhaya-ti*: AMg. vindhai, vindhemāṇa-, cf. Pischel 489; § 28.32
Pres. opt. vindhet Sādh 357.14 (prose; vv.ll. vivandhayet, bandhayet); vindhayet Sādh 384.15 (prose); pple. vindhantīm Sādh 298.4 (vs); vindhayantīm Sādh 301.1 (prose)
(4) Miscellaneous
Aor. aviddha (? by em.; § 31.82) Mv i.131.15
Gdve. vedhanīya Śikṣ 42.15. Cf. Skt. vedhana, vedha, etc.

2 *vyadh-* : *vyadha-ti*, shake, tremble; doubtless false Skt. for vedh-, q.v. (or may be regarded as blend of this and Skt. vyathati)
Pres. vyadhati pravyadhati saṃpravyadhati Divy 46.7
Ppp. vyadhita-, pravyadhita-, saṃpravyadhita- Divy 327.9

vraj-, proceed: (1) *vraja-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. vraje Mv ii.328.22; vraji SP 111.2; vrajeyā LV 201.18; pravrajiyāmaḥ (mss.) Mv ii.234.1 (§ 29.34); impv. pravrajāhi Mv ii.210.1; (with caus. mg., § 38.24) Mv iii.386.13; pravrajehi (caus. mg., Senart em. °vrāj°) Mv iii.268.5; pple. vrajāna- (§ 34.4) Divy 392.20
Fut. pravrajiṣyaṃ (caus. mg., § 38.24) Mv iii.268.6
Aor. vrajī LV 236.18; pravraji Mv ii.166.3; vrajiṣū LV 169.12; pravraje Mv iii.191.6; vrajesi Mv ii.86.8; pravrajetsuḥ (mss.; caus. mg.; § 38.24). Mv i.323.9
Ger. pravrajitvā SP 465.3; °tvāna Samādh 8.29; pra-vrajiya Mv ii.43.1; °yāna LV 240.9
(2) *-vrajya-ti*; in some Pkts. vajjai, Pischel 488
Pres. (both prose) pravrajyāmi Divy 574.1; impv. pravraj-yāhi Mv ii.147.5 (kept by Senart)
Fut. (allegedly opt., § 31.21) anupravrajyehaṃ Mv iii.50.16 (so mss., Senart em. °jehaṃ)
(3) Caus. *pravrājaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. (non-caus. mg.) pravrājayeyam Gv 417.15 (§ 38.23)
Fut. pravrājayiṣye Divy 260.20
Aor. pravrājayi (3 pl.) Mv iii.271.5

-śaṃsa-ti, praise (Skt.)
Aor. praśaṃse Mv ii.119.3
Pass. praśaṃsyate Mv i.88.8 (§ 37.31)

śak-, be able: (1) *śakno-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. śaknoma (followed by ā-; one ms. śaknoma-r-ā°) Mv iii.427.2; śaknotha Mv i.313.9; śaknonti Mv iii.74.6 (all prose; § 28.62)
(2) Pass. *śakya-te* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. śakyeya Mv iii.392.15
(3) *śakya-ti, -te* as active and personal, 'can' (so Epic Skt., see BR); also semi-MIndic *śakk-*: Pali sakkati, AMg. sakkei (both apparently rare), Pkt. sakkai (commoner); in BHS fairly common. Looks like use of passive form as active, cf. § 37.22
Pres. śakyati Mv iii.151.15; 159.13; °asi LV 143.22; 147.14; Mv iii.390.16; Divy 303.30; 397.24; 490.18; °āmi LV 143.22; 147.16; Mv ii.247.17; iii.390.17; Divy 358.10; 486.11; °āmo Mv ii.175.10; °āma Mv iii.126.3 (prose; in same line śaknoti); °atha Mv ii.175.9; śakyase Divy 374.19; opt. śakyeya Mv iii.126.18; °yā (1 sg.) Mv ii.249.1; °yaṃ Mv ii.171.18
Ppp. śakkitam, it was possible, Av ii.23.2; 71.1 (Speyer em. śakitam both times)
(4) **śakṣa-ti* (§ 28.41), false Skt. to Pali sakkhati, which derives from fut. śakṣyati but came to be used also as pres. even in Pali, as is shown by the fact that a new fut. sakkhissati is formed on it. In Sn 319,834 the forms sakkhati, sagghasi are to be taken as presents
Ppp. śakṣitaṃ Mv iii.263.15 (prose: asmābhi na śa° . . . kartum, we could not do . . .)
(5) Miscellaneous
śakyā (uninflected) = Pali, Pkt. sakkā, (it) is possible, Mv i.351.10 etc. (Dict.)

śaṅk-, doubt: (*śaṅka-ti*, Caus. *śaṅkaya-ti*, both Skt.)
Pass. of caus. (?), pres. pple. saṅkīyanto (for śa°) Mv iii.37.9 (see Dict.), lit., being made anxious? (§ 37.6)

śaṭ-: *śāṭaya-ti, śāṭe-ti*, destroy: Pali sāṭeti (Skt. śātayati). Note that Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā fol. 196[3] V 2 (Lüders, Kl. Skt. Texte 2, 177, cf. 63) has the regular Skt. śāt- in a passage corresponding to a Pali passage containing sāṭ-
Pres. śāṭayati Mvy 2423; śāṭeti Mv iii.385.17

śabdaya-ti (Skt.) or *śabda-ti* (cf. Pali saṃsaddati), sound (denom.); Caus. *śabdāpaya-ti* (Epic Skt.), *śabdāvaya-ti*, cause to be called, have summoned, §§ 38.56, 70
Pres. °payati Divy 31.23 f.; opt. °payethāḥ Divy 484.6; impv. śabdāpehi Mv iii.36.2
Fut. śabdāpayiṣyati Divy 5.24 f.
Ppp. śabdāpita- Mv i.272.14 etc.; śabdāvita- Mv iii.36.2
Ger. śabdāpayitvā Mv ii.435.4; 441.1; °piya Mv ii.78.3 (so read); 110.14; śabdāvitvā Mv ii.421.5; 442.2; śabdāviyāna Mv ii.453.13; iii.287.16 (and v.l. for °piyāna ii.173.1)
Inf. śabdāpayitum Divy 171.5

śam-, be quiet: (1) *śama-ti* (also *sa°*). Not in Skt. unless in the very questionable ἅπ.λεγ. praśamet (Rām. Gorr., see BR); not recognized for Pali by Geiger or PTSD but occurs there at least once (see below); in AMg. and other Pkt. occurs as samai. Back formation from the Skt. causative, esp. its ppp. śamita; § 28.30
Pres. vopasamanti, are pacified, Mv iii.371.5; cf. § 3.71; would be vūpasamanti in Pali, but the same vs Jāt. v.143.2 reads ūpasamanti (queried by Fausböll, but now supported by, and supporting, our form)
Fut. praśamiṣyati Mv i.289.4 (Skt. Gr.)
(2) Caus. *śamaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. praśami (§ 38.27) Sukh 23.5; śameya Suv 37.16; impv. samehi LV 359.11
Ppp. praśamayita- Mv i.254.8 (§ 34.8)
(3) Caus. *śāmaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. praśāmi (§ 38.27) Sukh 23.6; impv. niśāmehi Mv ii.88.13

śal-, shake (Skt. Gr. śalate, Pali salayati)
Ppp. śalita-, stirred up, Jm 89.23

śallaya-ti, afflict, injure: cf. AMg. sallai
Inf. śallayituṃ Mmk 462.19

śās-, order: (1) *śāsa-ti* (Skt.); also *śāsaya-ti, śāse-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Pres. impv. anuśāsayāhi Gv 54.16; samanuśāsehi Mv ii.103.14
Aor. prāśāsi (mss. prās°) Mv ii.394.18; anuśāse Mv iii.104.14
Gdve. śāsayitavya- Divy 243.28
Pass. opt. śāsīyema Mv iii.166.14
(2) Miscellaneous
Fut. anuśākṣyati (? § 31.25) Suv 81.6

śikṣa-ti, learn (Skt.)
Fut. śikṣiṣenti Gv 481.1 (§§ 3.116; 31.28)
Aor. śikṣiṣu Sukh 74.6
Ger. anuśikṣi LV 422.5
Caus. śikṣāpayasi LV 125.19; °peti Mv iii.362.5; impv. °pehi Mv iii.362.4; Fut. °payiṣyāmi Mv iii.362.1; Ppp. °pita- Mv iii.394.9 etc.

(*ava-, o-*)*śira-ti*, also *-śire-ti*, sometimes *-sara-ti*, abandon, etc.; MIndic root (also spelled *°sir°*); see Dict.
Pres. ośirati Mv ii.426.7; iii.1.6; 2.11; osiranti Mv i.24.1; avasirasi Mv iii.165.12; osiresi (2 sg.) Mv iii.165.19; opt. osireyā Mv ii.315.6; osire (v.l. oś°) Mv ii.383.7; impv. osirāhi Mv ii.272.13; pple. osiratu (n. sg. m.) Gv 255.14
Fut. ośiriṣyati Mv ii.426.18 (v.l. osar°); 427.10; osariṣyasi (mss.) Mv ii.459.15
Aor. avaśire (3 pl.; v.l. °sire; Senart em. °kire) Mv ii.343.19; osire (3 pl., v.l. oś°) Mv iii.273.16; avaśiri Mv ii.344.15 (so read, mss. avaśiti, avati, Senart avasṛjati); ośiri Mv ii.349.16 (so mss., Senart em. °kiri); ośarī(-r) LV 357.3 (Dict. s.v. avaśirati 3)
Ger. ośiritvā Mv i.143.13 (read °tva m.c.; no v.l.) = 200.9 (here mss. osaritva) = ii.4.6 (here mss. okiritvā); ii.298.6 (mss. ośiritvā or okir°); ii.334.22; 335.4; 367.19; 452.16; ośiritvāna Mv ii.367.22; avaśiriyā LV 240.15
Gdve. ośiritavya- Mv ii.424.20; 425.16

śiṣ-, leave: (1) Caus. (*vi-*)*śeṣa-ti* for *-śeṣaya-ti* (which is Skt.)
Pres. viśeṣanti Laṅk 357.1; 371.3 (§ 38.28)
(2) Miscellaneous
[Inf. ucchesṭum (? v.l. ucchre°), to send forth, Divy 186.5; see Dict.]

śiṣya-te, denom., learn (? Dict.); cf. also next
Pres. śiṣyate LV 127.4
Caus. śiṣyāpayiṣyasi LV 126.12

śiṣyaya-ti, -te, instruct, make into a pupil (denom., or caus. to prec.)
Fut. śiṣyayiṣyāmi LV 127.2; °ṣye LV 126.20

śī-, lie: (1) *śe-te* (Skt.)
Pres. 3 pl. śenti (analog. to śeti for śete; or to śayati, § 28.60) Ud xvii.4; impv. śehi (or sehi; mss. mehi) LV 196.10
Aor. aśesi (so read, § 32.64) Mv ii.86.8
(2) *śaya-te, -ti* (Skt.)
Caus. Ppp. śayāpita- (so read for śayāyita-, § 38.53) Mv iii.39.6; 40.2

(3) Caus. *śāyayati* (Skt.)
Ppp. śāyita- MSV iii.142.1
Caus. ppp. śāyāpita-(ka-), see § 38.61 and Dict.

śuc-: *śoca-ti*, burn, grieve (Skt.)
Pres. impv. śocāhi Mv ii.218.13
Aor. śocetsuḥ Mv iii.69.7

śudh-: Caus. *śodhaya-ti*, purify (Skt.)
Aor. saṃśodhayi SP 114.1; śodhaye Mv i.336.15; viśodhensuḥ Mv ii.199.3
Ger. viśodhetvā (§ 35.25) Mv i.4.7
Gdve. viśodheya- (§ 34.24) Mv iii.318.2, 3
Caus. opt. śodhāpayet SP 107.6; Ppp. śodhāpita- Mv iii.298.8

śubh-, be beautiful: *śobha-ti*, *-te* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. śobheya Mv iii.10.16
Aor. śobhe Mv ii.306.16
Caus. śobhāpayati Mmk 644.17

śuṣ-, get dry: (1) *śuṣya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. suṣye LV 330.3
(2) Caus. *śoṣaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. upaśoṣaye Mv ii.239.2; śoṣeya Mv ii.329.7
Fut. (pass.) viśoṣiṣyase LV 334.13

**śuṣka-ti* or *śuṣkaya-ti* (*-te*), get dry (denom.): Pali sukkhati
Inf. śuṣkitum Divy 397.27

śṛ-, crush: (1) Pass. *śīrya-te* (Skt.)
Aor. śīryetsuḥ Mv ii.1^6.9
(2) Caus. *śāraya-ti* (Skt. Gr. only)
Ppp. viśārita- LV 351.6

śekhe-ti, train; denom. to Pali se(k)kha-, AMg. seha-, BHS śaikṣa- (Dict.); cf. AMg. sehai; also miswritten śeṣ-; and with s for ś
Pres. śekheti Mv iii.162.10
Ppp. sekhita- Mv iii.390.4 (for śe°); śeṣita- (miswriting for śekh°) Mv ii.73.10, 15
Pass. sekhīyati (v.l. śe°) Mv ii.423.15; śekhīyanti Mv ii.434.10; sekhiyanti Mv iii.184.6

śraṇ-: (*vi-*)*śrāṇaya-ti*, give (Skt.)
Pass. viśrāṇīyati Mv iii.405.2; pple. viśrāṇiyantehi Mv ii.72.17

śrama-ti, be weary (Skt.)
Ger. viśramitvā Mv ii.106.2
Inf. viśramituṃ Mv iii.350.21

śrambh-, *śrabh-*, (with *vi-*) trust; (with *pra-*, *prati-pra-*), be still, (trans.) still; also with s for ś: (1) (*pra-*, *prati-pra-*)-*śrabhya-ti*, *-te*, also with s-, be abated; ger. (trans.) still: apparently not in Pali, which only has (paṭip)passambhati, is calmed, and °bheti, calms (caus.); these cpds. seem not to exist at all in Pkt.
Pres. (intrans., or passive?) prasrabhyate Mvy 1587; pratiprasrabhyati Mv i.253.10 (and in 8 read °śrabhyeyā? for mss. °śasteyā, Senart em. °śāmyeyā); pratiprasrabhyante Divy 68.3; 138.10; 367.1 (mss. °śra°); 568.15; Mmk 183.6 (°śra°)
Ger. prasrabhya (trans.) Mvy 1179 f., 1185 f.; pratiprasrabhya (or °śrabhya; trans.) Divy 161.11; 163.3; 190.22; 494.22; 549.10; Mmk 182.3
(2) Caus. *-śrambhaya-ti* (or °*sra*°; Skt.)
Pres. opt. viśrambhayi SP 114.12
Aor. visrambhesi Mv ii.242.15
Inf. pratiprasrambhayitum Mv i.254.2

śri-, resort: (1) *śraya-ti* (Skt.), *śre-ti*; Skt. ucchrita, ppp. (see §§ 38.44 ff.)
Pres. impv. ucchethā, for ucchrethā LV 335.13 (vs), see s.v. *chid* (3)
Fut. ucchreṣyaṃ Mv ii.126.6
Ger. niśrayitvā (Skt. śrayitvā 'E +', Wh. Roots) SP 335.11 (? so Nep. mss., text niṣevitvā with Kashgar rec.), and SP 48.6 with WT.
Caus. (a) ucchrāpayanti Mv ii.112.18; Aor. ucchrāpayetsu Mv ii.343.22; ppp. ucchrāpitaḥ MSV i.75.8, in same passage ucchrāyitaḥ Divy 77.20 (mss., here em. °pitaḥ); 466.16; prob. by error; § 38.17
(b) blend of prec. with ucchreti (§ 38.65), impv. ucchrepaya LV 399.19; Ppp. ucchrepita- LV 213.18; 351.7; Suv 62.8
(2) Miscellaneous forms
Ger. niśrāya (§ 35.20) SP 12.15 etc.; adhi-śrāya Jm 35.5. In Divy 264.18 (prose) ucchriyitvā, having raised (trans.), surely corrupt; read ucchrepitvā or ucchrāpitvā or °payitvā (to 1, above), or even ucchrayitvā = normal Skt. ucchritya

śru-, hear: (1) *śṛṇo-ti*, *śṛṇu-te* (Skt.), also semi-MIndic *śruṇo-ti* etc.
Pres. (§ 28.62) śṛṇoma (before vowel) Mv i.289.1; (before consonant) Mv ii.79.9; śṛṇotha SP 324.8; śṛṇonti SP 325.7; śṛṇonte (°ta, before u-) Gv 236.11; śrūṇute (§§ 3.26, 96) LV 74.9; opt. śṛṇuyā LV 42.19; śruṇuya (§ 29.42) LV 54.2; śruṇo (3 sg. opt.? § 29.46, or imperf., § 32.124) SP 230.4; impv. śṛṇohi SP 352.6; pple. śṛṇumāna- Śikṣ 107.9 (§ 34.3); śṛṇotu LV 364.5 (§ 18.35)
(2) *śṛṇva-ti*, § 28.6; apparently not recorded elsewhere
Pres. 3 sg. śṛṇvati SP 359.8 (one ms. śṛṇoti, metrically impossible); Mv iii.83.1 (v.l. paśyati! with object śabdaṃ); impv. 2 pl. śṛṇvata Śikṣ 1.6 (but here meter requires short first syllable); śṛṇvadhvam Mmk 104.26; 105.10
(3) *śruṇa-ti* (rarely written *śu*°, *su*°, but in vss never makes preceding syllable long in cpds.); Pali suṇati; §§ 3.96; 28.17. (n is often written for ṇ)
Pres. śruṇati Mv ii.201.6; Śikṣ 258.3; pratiśruṇāmi Mv ii.214.10; śruṇanti LV 97.9; 233.10; opt. śruṇe Mv ii.387.5; śruṇeya Suv 51.13 (here 1 sg.); KP 159.17; read śruṇeyā in LV 80.12 for ed. śuṇeṣyā (all mss. śru-); śruṇiyāma (§ 29.34) LV 364.11; impv. śruṇā LV 94.12; pple. śruṇanto Mv iii.71.14; 373.4 (v.l. in both śṛṇvanto); śruṇamāna- Mv iii.83.8; 264.14; Gv 34.18; 215.15, 16
Fut. śruṇiṣyati LV 54.6; °yanti SP 236.4; °yi (1 sg. mid., §§ 26.3; 31.35) LV 222.13
Aor. śruṇi (3 pl.) SP 90.4; sunetsu(?) Mv i.247.7; śruṇensu (WT with K′ °ṇimsu) SP 52.12 (? § 32.101; quoted as śṛṇūṣu or śṛṇotsu!); śruṇetsu Mv i.337.2
Ger. śruṇitvā LV 230.7; 232.13 etc.: śuṇitvā LV 57.5, 15; śruṇitvāna Mv ii.227.14; °tvanā LV 235.21; śruṇiya Mv i.204.7; śruṇiyāna SP 61.9; śruṇi SP 351.11; Mv ii.12.3 (mss.); śruṇituna (? § 35.36) Mv ii.12.17
Inf. śruṇitum Suv 157.5
Gdve. śruṇitavya- SP 308.11
Pass. śruṇīyati Mv ii.97.7; iii.297.8; °te Suv 157.2
(4) *śruṇe-ti*: MIndic sunei ('In JM. AMg. überwiegt aber die Flexion nach der e-Conjugation,' Pischel 503). Rare in BHS
Pres. impv. śruṇehi Mv iii.140.13 (§ 38.21)
(5) Pass. *śruya-ti*, etc., prob. miswriting for *śrū*° = Skt. śrūyate, § 37.36)
Pres. śruyanti Mv ii.31.3, etc.
(6) Caus. *śrāvaya-ti* (Skt.), also in non-caus. mg.

Pres. opt. śrāved SP 229.7; impv. śrāvehi Mv ii.256.7
Aor. śrāvayiṃsu SP 194.5; anuśrāvayetsuḥ Mv i.40.11, 16
Ger. saṃśrāvayi SP 384.1
Inf. (non-caus. mg.) pratiśrāvayitum Divy 207.7 (§ 38.23)
(7) Desid. *śuśruya-ti*?
Pres. pple. acc. sg. śuśruyantaṃ Gv 520.23 (prose); § 40.1; cf. Pali sussūyati
(8) Miscellaneous forms
Opt. śṛṇyāt Gv 522.16 (? § 29.45)
Aor. aśroṣīt LV 143.13; aśroṣī Mv ii.272.3; °ṣi Mv i.319.15; °ṣuḥ (3 pl.) Mv i.258.21; § 32.69
Prec. śruyāt, prob. m.c. for śrūyāt (Wh. Roots) Mmk 207.3 taṃ ca śabdaṃ śruyāt kṣipraṃ (fitting regular scheme of anuṣṭubh); § 3.46
Inf. śravaṇāya SP 431.1; 459.1

śliṣ-, embrace: Caus. *-śleṣayati*, in non-caus. mg. (§ 38.23)
Pres. opt. saṃśleṣayet SP 114.9

śvas-, breathe: Caus. *-śvāsaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. āśvāseyaṃ Mv i.39.5; āśvaseyā LV 300.19 (vs; a for ā m.c.)

**saṃhāraya-ti*, gather (prob. for saṃbhārayati, denom. to saṃbhāra, § 38.57)
Caus. Gdve. saṃhārāpayitavya- Mv iii.178.5

sakka-ti, go (MIndic): Pali ava-, apa-, o-sakkati; see Dict. s.v.
Pres. avasakkanti Mv i.23.10 (mss. °sappanti); impv. osakka Mv ii.83.2; pple. parisakkantaṃ Mv ii.254.3
Ppp. osakkita- Mv i.353.14
Ger. anusak(k)ya, following(?), Mv i.23.11; Dict. s.v. anuśakya

**saja-ti*, send forth: Pali id., MIndic for Skt. sṛjati, § 3.90. Pali also has forms in sañj-, Dict.
Ppp. sajita- (v.l. saṃj°) Mv i.37.1
Ger. utsajitva Gv 481.25

sajjaya-ti (Skt.), *sajje-ti*, prepare
Pres. impv. sajjehi Mv i.148.7
Fut. sajjiṣyaṃ Mv ii.274.8
Pass. sajjiyati Mv ii.274.16

sad-, sit: (1) *sīda-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. prasīde Mv ii.45.1; prasīdeya Mv iii.437.7; impv. niṣīdāhi Mv ii.96.17; pple. niṣīdiyāna- SP 295.5 (§ 34.5)
Fut. niṣīdiṣyaṃ Mv iii.225.11; °ṣyāmo Mv iii.427.4
Aor. niṣīdi (3 pl.) Mv ii.29.4; niṣīde Mv i.4.6; niṣīdetsuḥ Mv i.152.7
Ger. niṣīditvā SP 236.8; niṣīdiyāna SP 283.12 (§ 35.45)
Gdve. niṣīditavya- Mv i.354.14.
Caus. (on niṣīdayati as caus. see below) Ger. niṣīdāpayitvā Mv ii.435.13; °petvā Mv iii.298.18
(2) *(ni)ṣedyāmi*, Pres., Fut. niṣetsyāmi, and Gdve. (ni)ṣettavya-, hyper-Skt. quasi-denom. to Pkt. ṇisejjā, seat, = BHS niṣadyā; see Dict. s.v. niṣedyati
(3) *(ni)ṣīdaya-ti*, *(ni)ṣīde-ti*, MIndic caus. to niṣīdati (§ 38.9); also as non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Pres. (caus.) niṣīdayati LV 70.21; Divy 295.14; (non-caus.) niṣīdeti Mv i.306.12 (with mss.); opt. niṣīdayed (non-caus.) SP 344.1
Fut. (caus.) niṣīdayiṣyāmaḥ Divy 420.25
(4) Caus. *sādaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. prasādehi Mv iii.106.9
Aor. prasādaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.106.8; prasādayesi Mv iii.106.2; prasādesi Mv iii.56.1

(*sara-ti*, see *sṛ-*, *smṛ-*, and *śira-ti*)

sarasarāya-te, onomat., prob. rustle: pple. °yamāṇa- Kv 30.13 (Dict.)

saha-ti, prevail (Skt.)
Ppp. utsahita- Mv ii.90.6
Ger. sahitva RP 21.5

sātiya-ti or *sādī*°, take pleasure in (denom.); see Dict. and cf. *svādīyati*
Pres. °yati SP 277.8

sādhaya-ti, accomplish (Skt.)
Aor. sādhemsu LV 387.1 (§ 32.101)

sābhiya-ti, be slow (see Dict.)
Pres. °yati Śikṣ 152.7 (mss.)

sārajya-ti, be attached = Pali sārajjati (Skt. saṃrajyate); § 3.3
Pres. °yanti Mv iii.295.15 (Senart's em. but plausible)

si-, bind (Skt. -syati)
Ppp. vyavasta- Divy 416.26 (for vyavasita-, § 3.112)

sic-, pour: (1) *siñca-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. utsiṃci (1 sg.) Mv ii.92.6; abhy-aṣiṃcet Mmk 51.4 (§ 32.12); impv. abhiṣiṃcāhi Mv i.349.7
Fut. abhiṣiṃciṣyaṃ Mv ii.158.3; °ṣyanti Mv iii.207.1
Ger. siñcitvā SP 147.6; abhiṣiñcya Mv iii.353.6 (§ 35.13)
Gdve. abhiṣiñcitavya- Mv i.51.5
(2) *sica-ti*; § 28.12; not recorded elsewhere. In all the following mss. lack the nasal (they mostly write un- for ut-); Senart writes °siṃc° (which in ii.92.6 is favored by meter; the others are prose) except in ii.90.17 where he keeps °sic°
Pres. utsicāmi Mv ii.90.15, 17
Aor. utsici Mv ii.92.6
Inf. utsicitum Mv ii.91.1

siv-, sew: (1) **sīva-ti* (§ 28.29)
Ppp. sīvita- Mv iii.313.4
Ger. sīvitvā Mv iii.313.7
(2) **se-ti*, see § 28.50
Gdve. setavya- MSV ii.50.13, 15; perh. to be read, with Roth's note, 152 f., on Nirukta 11.31, with the shorter version (p. 206), for sevitavya of both edd., which Sarup derives from sev-
Inf. setum (ms. sentum) MSV ii.50.16 (§ 36.10)
(3) Miscellaneous
Inf. syotu-kāma- Av i.182.8 (§ 36.10)

sukhāya-te, be happy (denom., Skt.)
Caus. sukhāpaye (1 sg. mid.; so with mss.) Mv iii.355.8; Ppp. sukhāpita- Suv 96.2; Inf. sukhāpayitu-kāma- Suv 94.16; Gdve. sukhāpayitavya- Suv 79.6

subha-ti, smite (§ 28.31): Pali only sumbhati (also with paṭi-, pari-), and AMg. visumbh-
Pres. subhanti Mv i.14.2, 12; paṭisubhanti Mv i.20.3; visubhanti Mv i.27.8

sūcaya-ti, indicate (denom., Skt.)
Pres. pple. sūcata Śikṣ 342.10 (§ 38.30)

sūtraya-ti, cut into shreds (strings; denom.; Skt. in other senses)
Ppp. sūtrita- Mv i.5.7
Ger. sūtrayitvāna Mv i.12.16

sṛ-, move (see also s.vv. *-śirati*, *smṛ-*): (1) *sara-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. samosari (3 pl.) Gv 231.1; osare Mv ii.222.1;

abhisaresi Mv ii.198.14; abhisarasi Mv ii.198.4 (3 sg., § 32.62)
Ppp. saṃsarita- Mv i.46.4
Ger. saṃsaritvā Mvy 6628; Mv i.244.19
Inf. saṃsaritum Mv iii.253.3
(2) *-sarya-ti*, nowhere recorded
Pres. opt. upasaryet AsP 390.9 (prose)
(3) Caus. *sāraya-ti* (Skt.), also in non-caus. mg.
Pres. opt. prasāraye Mv iii.422.17; impv. prasārehi Mv iii.401.15
Aor. (non-caus.) avasāri (§§ 32.19; 38.23) Mv i.319.16 etc.; avasārim (§ 32.39) Mv ii.119.6; anusāre Mv iii.101.16 (§ 38.23)
Ger. vyatisārayitvā Mv iii.47.18 (vīti°); 60.11 (°sāretvā); 206.1; 208.13; 325.14; 443.19
Pass. utsaryati, for utsāryate, Mv ii.92.18 (§ 3.34)

sṛj-, send out, away (see also **saja-ti*): (1) *sṛjya-ti, -te*; cf. AMg. sajjai, Pali ussajjitvā AN iv.191.11; these are prob. originally based on 'caus.' Skt. forms like (vi)-sarjayati (see next) = (vi)sṛjati; even Skt. has very rarely sarjati. Our sṛjyati may be false Skt. for these MIndic forms (§ 28.26)
Pres. utsṛjyate (Mironov °ti) Mvy 2558 (Tib. gtoṅ ba, abandon); pple. pratisṛjyantau (dual) Mv i.181.1, Dict.
(2) *sṛjati* (Skt.)
Caus. pratinisṛjāpayiṣyanti MSV iv.140.7
(3) 'Caus.' *-sarjaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. visarjehi Mv i.363.9 (even in Skt. = visṛjati)
(4) Miscellaneous
Fut. -srakṣati (? § 31.29) Mvy 5232

sekh-, see *śekh-*

seva-ti, -te, serve (Skt.); perhaps also *seve-ti*, non-caus., § 38.21
Pres. opt. seveyā Mv i.366.1; impv. upasevehi (non-caus.) Mv ii.103.13 (but cf. § 30.5); sevahi LV 28.22
Ger. sevitva Mv ii.327.8; niṣevitvā SP 335.11 (acc. to text). (sevitvā 'E', Whitney, Roots)

skanda-ti, leap (Skt.)
Aor. saṃpraskande Mv ii.157.13

skhala-ti, stumble (Skt.); MIndic *khala-ti* = Pali id.
Pres. pple. prakhalamāna- Mv ii.151.3
Aor. khali (v.l. skhali; 2 sg.) LV 362.11

(*anu-*)*stanaya-ti* (?*stanāya-ti*), mourn: cf. Pali anutthunāti, id., connected with Skt. stanati
Aor. anustanayetsu(ḥ) Mv i.341.8 ff. (mss. °stanā°, in 11 °strānā°)

stambh-, stabh-, hold firm (Skt.)
Fut. avaṣṭapsyate (§ 31.23) Divy 574.18; 575.7

stu-, praise: (1) *stava-ti* (RV stavate), also *stavaya-ti*, non-caus.: Pali thavati. Vedic inheritance conceivable; more likely analogical new formation, but specific source not clear; fut. staviṣyati is only Vedic
Pres. stavamī Bhad 4; stavanti Śikṣ 339.11; abhistavati Mv ii.157.10; °vanti SP 12.6; opt. saṃstaveyā SP 229.11
Aor. staviṣu LV 329.14; stavimsū LV 233.19; abhistavinsuḥ Suv 243.10 (prose); stavayimsu LV 414.10; abhyaṣṭavīt RP 5.6 (§ 32.45); abhistave Mv ii.266.2; abhistavetsuḥ Mv ii.187.6
Ppp. stavita- LV 294.17; Suv 64.9
Ger. stavitvā LV 225.4; staviya Mv ii.372.15 (read with mss. guṇa staviya)

(2) *stuvati*: § 28.7; AMg. thuvai (Ratnach.)
Imperfect abhistuva LV 185.11 (§ 32.115)
Ger. stuviya LV 50.4 (vs), see Dict.
(3) *stuti*
Pres., ed. stuti m.c. for ms. stauti Śikṣ 341.11 (vs); see Dict.
(4) Miscellaneous forms
Aor. abhyaṣṭāvīt RP 2.18; staviṣṭ(a) LV 298.6; § 32.46
Pass. pres. pple. stuvantaṃ, being praised, LV 195.20 (§ 37.35)

stṛ-: *stara-ti*, strew; sporadic in Skt.
Pres. impv. saṃstarāhi (v.l. °ehi) Mv ii.236.5
Aor. prastare (1 sg.) Mv iii.249.2
Ppp. an-āstarita- Jm 220.14 (prose)
Ger. saṃstaritvā LV 133.19; saṃstari Śikṣ 342.5; uttharya (?printed uttarya) Kv 32.17 (§§ 2.12; 35.12)
Gdve. saṃstaritavya- Mv i.273.3
Pass. Aor. saṃstaryetsu(ḥ) Mv i.235.17 (mss.), see § 37.31

stomaya-ti, praise (Skt. Gr.): Pali thometi; denom. from stoma-
Ppp. stomita- (Pali thomita-) Mvy 2614; LV 7.22 (so read); Bhīk 24a.4

sthā-, stand: (1) *tiṣṭha-ti* (Skt.), also *tiṣṭhaya-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Pres. opt. tiṣṭhayet Sādh 411.18; anutiṣṭhayema (Senart with v.l. °ṣṭhiyema) Mv iii.290.1; tiṣṭhe Mv iii.53.13; tiṣṭheyā Mv ii.150.11; tiṣṭhiya (§ 29.34) SP 251.6; impv. tiṣṭhāhi Mv ii.449.8
Aor. vyuttiṣṭhet (§ 32.87) SP 182.13; avatiṣṭhet Mv i.220.9 = avatiṣṭhe ii.22.10; tiṣṭhetsuḥ Mv i.52.3; tiṣṭhema (§ 32.105) Mv i.345.5, 14; (in caus. mg., § 38.24) pratitiṣṭhe Mv iii.294.10
Ger. tiṣṭhitvā SP 253.9
(2) *-the-ti*: Pali -ṭheti, Pkt. -ṭhei (cf. also *-sthayati*, 3); § 28.48
Pres. opt. or impv. (§ 29.11) utthi (only in vss, 2 sg., m.c. for utthe) LV 236.4; 322.3; Gv 488.18, and probably 16; impv. utthehi Mv ii.229.17; iii.6.7; 315.14 (in same vs LV 397.10 uttiṣṭha)
Fut. uttheṣya (1 sg.) LV 368.10; uttheṣyaṃ (so with v.l.; followed by ti = iti) Mv iii.83.15
Aor. utthesi (§ 32.64; 3 sg.) Mv ii.349.6
(3) *-sthaya-ti*: cf. *-theti* (2), and Pkt. utthai (Pischel 483, end); § 28.48
Pres. opt. adhiṣṭhayet Sādh 46.6; anuṣṭhayet Sādh 355.11 (both prose)
(4) **-thāya-ti*: Pali ṭhāyati (Geiger 132.3); § 28.24
Aor. pratyutthāyetsuḥ Mv iii.329.7
(5) *sthā-ti*: Pali ṭhāti, Pkt. ṭhāi. Geiger 132.2 says analog. to yāti; but rather see § 28.51
Pres. sthāti Mv ii.147.16 (here mss. sthāsi, sthāhi); iii.160.2; saṃsthāti Mv i.308.3; utthāti Mmk 157.20; adhiṣṭhāmi Gv 72.2 (prose); Sādh 268.8; impv. samupasthāhi Mv ii.225.6; utthātu Mmk 585.7; pple. sthātu (gen. sg.), sthāti (loc. sg.) Mv i.236.12, 13 = 241.6, 7
Aor. pratyasthā (§ 32.106; v.l. °sthāsi) Mv i.55.15; asthāsi (§ 32.54) SP 86.4; samavāsthāsīt (§ 32.55; Kashgar rec.) SP 239.3; asthāsu(ḥ), asthāṃsu(ḥ), asthānsu(ḥ), asthātsu(ḥ) Mv i.56.12 etc. (§ 32.75); upasthīya (? § 32.105) Mv i.304.9
(6) *-sthaha-ti*: Pali ṭhahati; § 28.42
Pres. adhiṣṭhahāmi SP 323.13; pratiṣṭhahanti SP 129.5; opt. adhiṣṭhahet Prāt 506.12 (prose; same passage in Pali, Vin. iv.47.25, adhiṭṭhaheyya)
Ger. utthahitvā Mv ii.159.11 (v.l.; text utthih°); 345.1; vyutthahitvā SP 295.7; abhyutthahitvā Mv ii.38.14
(7) *sthiha-ti, -te* (sometimes written with thi- for sthi-); unrecorded elsewhere, but very common here, in simplex

and all cpds.; prob. the regular pres. of the dialect (tiṣṭhati being largely Sktization); § 28.43. Cf. s.v. *dhā-* (10)
Pres. sthihanti Suv 49.20; 236.13; sthihate LV 29.1; 136.7; saṃsthihati Mv i.236.10 = 241.4; ii.262.13; saṃsthihanti Mv i.101.2; saṃsthihate KP 47.6 (vs; in prose 47.2 saṃtiṣṭhante); upasthihati Mv ii.211.17; 212.2 (here mss. °hiti), 7; upasthihasi Mv i.302.7 (?text °hisi); upasthihanti Mv i.227.8; adhisthihanti Mv ii.263.12; viṣṭhihati Mvy 6821 (mss. vary; Mironov viṣṭhirati); Śikṣ 18.6 (ms.; prose); utthihate LV 139.14; pratyutthihati Mv iii.114.11; opt. sthihi Mv ii.329.18; sthihed LV 369.1; sthiheyā LV 42.18; upasthiheya Mv ii.214.6; pratiṣṭhihe Vaj. Hoernle MR 180.14 (prose; in ed. Vaj 21.11 pratitiṣṭhet); upasthihesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.491.12; impv. sthihantu (v.l. thi°) Bhad 11; utthihantu Gv 34.14; pple. upasthihantasya Mv ii.212.3; a-viṣṭhihantā Dbh.g. 4(340).8
Fut. upasthihiṣyanti Mv i.325.19, 20; °ṣyāmi Mv ii.218.2
Aor. sthihetsuḥ Mv ii.302.8, 11; saṃsthihe Mv ii.234.5 = iii.65.6; 92.10; pratisthihiṣur (? § 32.36) Mv i.99.15; upasthihetsu (v.l. °suḥ) Mv iii.120.20; upasthihi Mv ii.489.11 (mss.); saṃsthihi Sukh 50.14; upasthihiṣu Gv 254.17; pratisthihiṃsu Mv i.203.4; saṃsthihesi (v.l. °sthahaṃsi; 3 pl.) Mv iii.276.1 (mss.)
Ger. sthihitva LV 93.1; pratiṣṭhihitvā SP 63.10 (here prob. caus. mg., § 38.24); LV 134.9, etc.; sthihitvāna Mv ii.308.1; sthihiya LV 240.17
Inf. upasthihitum Mv i.295.16; iii.24.15; utthihitum Mv ii.428.1
Pass. upasthihīyati Mv iii.23.17; pple. upasthihiyamāna- Mv ii.423.9

(8) Caus. *sthāpaya-ti* (Skt.), also in non-caus. mg.; also *thāp°*
Pres. sthāpite for sthāpayati LV 74.22 (§§ 3.48; 37.24); opt. utthāpayet, let him set forth, non-caus. (§ 38.58) LV 335.15; impv. utthāpehi Mv ii.430.6
Fut. thāpayiṣye LV 178.16 (most mss. sthā°)
Aor. sthāpayet Mv ii.119.4; upasthāpe (so read for °ye, provided) Mv i.336.15; sthāpayetsu(ḥ) Mv i.259.5
Ppp. vithāpita- LV 324.8 (Dict.); pratiṣṭhāpayita- (§ 34.8) Kv 18.20

(9) Caus. *sthapaya-ti*, *sthape-ti*; also *ṭha-*, *tha-*; the usual BHS and MIndic caus. (§ 38.52): Pali ṭhapeti
Pres. sthapemi SP 323.9; pratiṣṭhapemi (Kashgar rec.) SP 47.2; viṭhapayati KP 32.1 (prose); opt. sthapeyaṃ SP 128.2; pratiṣṭhapeyaṃ SP 47.4; upasthape (Kashgar rec. and WT) SP 88.12; upasthapesi (2 sg.) Mv ii.247.10; impv. sthapaya LV 12.15; 184.22; sthapayahi LV 167.8; sthapehi Gv 55.22; thapehi Mv ii.448.4; ṭhapetu Gv 34.24; upasthapetha Mv ii.95.11
Fut. utthapeṣyati Mv iii.3.16; sthapeṣya (1 sg.) LV 178.20; upasthapeṣyāmaḥ Mv ii.218.16; sthapeṣye LV 216.10
Aor. thapesī (§§ 32.63, 65; 2 sg.) LV 169.3; sthapī Gv 383.17
Ppp. sthapita- LV 166.9; viṭhapita- ŚsP 1534.7; thapita- Mv iii.36.12 etc.
Ger. sthapetvā Mv i.353.1; sthapitvā (so for text sthayitvā) Gv 122.12; upasthapetvā (non-caus., § 38.58) Mv ii.220.18; upasthapitvanā (so with v.l. for °pisvanā) LV 54.15; pratiṣṭhapiya Mv i.108.15
Gdve. ṭhapanīya- LV 127.17
Pass. impv. sthapīyatu Mv ii.69.12; thapīyatu 13; Fut. sthapīṣyati or sthapīyiṣyati (§§ 31.2, 3; 37.6) Mv ii.69.14

(10) Miscellaneous forms
Perfect 3 pl. tasthure (§ 33.5) Mmk 140.7 etc.; pple. avatasthivantaḥ (? § 34.6) LV 368.2

snā-, bathe: (1) *snāya-te* (Epic Skt.), *-ti*
Pres. impv. snāyāhi Mv ii.78.3
Aor. snāyetsuḥ Mv iii.439.2
Ger. snāyitvā Mv i.4.6
Inf. snāyituṃ (?but mss. snāpitum, see below) Mv iii.12.5

(2) Caus. *snāpaya-ti* (Skt.), also in non-caus. mg. (§ 38.58)
Pres. snāpayati (non-caus.) Mv ii.77.19; 78.1
Aor. snāpayet (§ 32.87), Śikṣ 155.3; snāpi (non-caus.) LV 271.12
Inf. snāpituṃ (mss., non-caus., Senart em. °yitum) Mv iii.12.5

(3) Caus. *snapaya-ti* (Skt.), also in non-caus. mg. (§ 38.58)
Pres. pple. snapayantaṃ (non-caus.) Mv ii.77.18
Aor. visnapī (3 pl.) LV 93.2; snapinsu LV 93.21, 22; snapayisu LV 234.4; °yiṃsu Mv i.99.11

spṛś-, touch: (1) *spṛśa-ti* (Skt.), also *spṛśaya-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21): semi-MIndic *pṛ°*; and with s for ś
Pres. opt. spṛśe Mv ii.399.2; impv. spṛśāhi (v.l. °ehi) Mv ii.199.19
Fut. spṛśiṣyasi SP 294.10; °ti LV 288.10 (s for ś); pṛsiṣyati (for spṛś°) LV 153.18; spṛśiṣye LV 287.4; Mv ii.404.2 (? °ṣya a-); spṛśiṣyi (2 sg.; § 31.35) Gv 58.2
Aor. spṛśe SP 190.7 (§ 32.87)
Ppp. a-spṛśita- Bbh 111.2 (prose); upaspṛśita-(vant-) Mmk 47.5 (prose)
Ger. spṛśitvā LV 301.2 etc.
Inf. spṛśayitum Mv ii.65.14

(2) *sparśa-ti* (Skt. once BhāgP, see BR s.v. 11): Pali phassati (phasse Sn, Geiger 134; samphassamāna-, PTSD s.v. samphusati); AMg. samphāse, cf. Pischel 486. Origin not clear to me; back-formation from caus. sparśayati?
Pres. saṃsparśati Gv 399.22 (prose); opt. visparśeyus Śikṣ 182.11 (prose); impv. sparśehi Mv iii.268.4

(3) Miscellaneous forms
Aor. prākṣur, 3 pl., LV 379.18; 380.2 (§ 32.80)
Ppp. pṛṣṭa- LV 122.7; (by error pṛṣṭha-) Divy 190.11
Inf. praṣṭum Mv ii.427.7; iii.158.5; Divy 519.18
Gdve. (as substantive) sparṣṭavya- Śikṣ 198.9, and perhaps intended by mss. Mv ii.391.16; § 34.21 and Dict.

sphāla-ti (*sphāle-ti*?), burst (intrans.): cf. Pali phāleti, trans. and intrans.; cf. Skt. sphalati (intrans., Gr.) and ā-sphālayati (caus., trans.)
Pres. opt. sphāleyā, would burst (intrans.; mss.) Mv iii.114.12
Caus. sphālayāmi, I burst (trans.), Av i.339.9 (mss. corrupt)

sphṛ-, suffuse, fill: (1) *sphara-ti* (Skt. Gr.), *°te* = Pali pharati; back-formation to caus. sphārayati? (perhaps on analogy of dhārayati: dharati?). See also *pharati*, *phalati*
Pres. spharati LV 250.20; Śikṣ 187.7; 216.5; spharanti Mv i.230.2; 240.12 (in parallels iii.334.9; 341.14 sphuranti, once v.l. spha°); Gv 43.6; spharate LV 196.21; pple. spharan Gv 10.14
Ger. spharitvā Divy 106.4; Bbh 263.10; 332.4; spharitvanā Gv 34.11
Gdve. a-spharaṇīya- Śikṣ 249.5, 8
Caus. parispharayati Mvy 1649; § 38.9. (In Skt. only sphārayati)

(2) *sphura-ti* (Skt.), also **sphuraya-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Fut. sphuriṣyati LV 145.3 (cited BR from Calc. as sphurayiṣyati)

Aor. sphuri LV 357.4
Ger. sphuritvā Mv ii.410.6; °tva LV 294.4; sphurayitvā LV 113.2 (prose)

smṛ-, be mindful: (1) *smara-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. opt. samanusmareya Mv ii.103.8; smareyāsi (2 sg.; § 29.37) Mv iii.20.12; impv. smarāhi LV 172.17
Aor. samanusmaret Mv i.228.16; °re Mv ii.284.8; anusmarasi (3 sg.) Mv i.4.8 (§ 32.62); smaresi Mv ii.300.12
Ppp. vismarita- Suv 103.4
Ger. smaritvā SP 115.11; smaritvana Gv 213.11; smari LV 167.2; anusmari Śikṣ 339.2
(2) *sara-ti* (MIndic) = Pali id. (§ 2.16)
Pres. saratī (= smarati) Mv iii.284.5 (vs)

srabh-, srambh-, see *śr°*

sru-, flow: *sruva-te*, not recorded elsewhere, unless we count śruvat RV 1.127.3; see §§ 3.57; 28.37
Pres. sruvate Mmk 456.17

svad-, 'caus.' (*ā-*)*svādaya-ti*, taste, eat (Skt.)
Aor. āsvādesi Mv i.339.10; āsvādayetsu(ḥ) Mv i.339.12

svap-, sleep: (1) *svapa-ti* (Skt.)
Ppp. svapita- Gv 254.22 (vs: svapiti, m.c. for °te, nṛpe, the king being asleep)
(2) **supa-ti, supi-ti*: Pali supati, Pkt. suvai; directly from Skt. svapati, svapiti, § 3.117
Pres. supiti Śikṣ 257.19
Ger. supiyāna Mv ii.201.19 (not caus.)
Caus. supeti (§ 38.9) Mv ii.423.7; 433.12; Ger. supiya, having put to sleep, LV 50.4 (? but see Dict.)
(3) *sopa-ti*: Pkt. sovai; not in Pali; § 3.117
Pres. osopati Mv ii.31.21 (prose)
Ppp. sopita- Mv i.155.20
(4) *svapya-ti*: Pali suppati, soppati (Geiger 136.2); § 28.28
Pres. svapyanti Megh 294.11

**svastyaya-ti*, thank, or reward; denom. from svasti-
Ger. svastyayitvā Mmk 60.15

svādīya-ti, take pleasure in (cf. *sātīya-ti, sādī°*) = Pali sādiyati; perhaps influenced secondarily by forms of svad-? Or MIndic pass. of caus. *svādayati*, is made to enjoy (so PTSD)?
Pres. °yati Mv ii.145.3

svādhyāya-, study (denom.): (1) *svādhyāya-ti*: Pali sajjhāyati (§ 38.35)
Pres. svādhyāyati Śikṣ 7.8; 197.5; °yanti Divy 631.22; impv. °yata LV 440.15; pple. svādhyāyanto SP 237.7; °yataḥ (gen. sg.) Divy 491.13; °yamāna- Divy 489.28; Suv 148.12 (so read); Gv 521.1
Fut. svādhyāyiṣyanti SP 478.7
Ppp. svādhyāyita- SP 420.1; Divy 55.7; 233.24; 464.18; Av i.287.8
Ger. svādhyāyya AsP 224.13
Inf. svādhyāyitum Divy 339.22
Pass. pple. svādhyāyyamāna- AsP 223.3
(2) **svādhyā-ti* (see §§ 28.54; 38.31)
Fut. svādhyāsyati Samādh p. 67 line 8; AsP 52.5, 21
Gdve. svādhyātavya- Samādh 22.8 (prose)
Pass. opt. svādhyāyeta, would be studied, SP 391.7

han-, strike, slay: (1) *hana-ti* (Epic and late Skt.): Pali id.; § 28.14
Pres. parāhanati LV 318.16; hananti Mv i.10.6; opt. parāhaṇe (1 sg.) Mv i.42.8; parāhaneya Mv ii.342.6; impv. parāhanāhi SP 178.10 (Kashgar rec.)
Aor. abhihanī (3 pl.) LV 329.4; parāhanitsu SP 69.11 (Kashgar rec.); hane Mv ii.342.8; āhaneya Mv ii.412.19 (§ 32.105)
Ger. nihanitvā LV 287.4; hanitvāna Mv ii.223.12; nihanitvana Samādh 22.5; parāhaniya LV 343.1
Inf. hanitum Mv i.312.6
(2) Pass. *hanya-te* (Skt.)
Pres. praty-ahanyanti (§ 32.8) Mv i.6.9 ff.; opt. hanyeyā Mv i.364.2; impv. vihanyāhi Mv ii.405.16
Ppp. vihanyita- Mv i.155.14 (§ 37.26)
(3) Caus. *ghātaya-ti* (Skt.), also *ghāta-ti* (§ 38.28)
Pres. ghātanti (mss.) Mv i.27.8; opt. ghāteran Laṅk 252.16; ghātaye (2 sg.) Mv iii.387.13
Aor. aghātaye Mv iii.360.17
Caus. Ppp. ghātāpita- (§ 38.57) Mv ii.170.15; ghātāvita- (§ 38.70) Mv i.19.2; Inf. ghātāpayituṃ Mv i.132.8
(4) Miscellaneous forms
Fut. hansye (§ 31.23) LV 311.18; read vihatsyase (§ 31.24) LV 335.1

hasa-ti, laugh (Skt.)
Aor. ūhasāsi (Dict. and § 32.59) Mv i.221.20 = ii.24.7; ūhase Mv ii.268.13 ff.; in Mv i.218.18 = ii.20.20 read prob. ūhasi for text ūhati, which (like Senart, see his note) I cannot interpret

hā-, leave: (1) *jaha-ti* (Skt. 'E+'): Pali id.; § 28.9
Pres. opt. jahe Mv ii.390.21; viprajaheya Ud xx.1; impv. viprajahāhi Mv ii.142.18
Fut. jahiṣyāmi ('E+' in Whitney, Roots) Mv iii.52.16
Aor. jahī LV 134.17; vijahe Mv i.329.6
Ppp. jahita- LV 173.20; 242.4 (§ 34.10)
Ger. jahitvā SP 13.1; °tvanā LV 325.8; vijahitvāna Mv i.268.21; vijahya (§ 35.14) LV 202.6; vijahiya LV 232.22; vijahiyāna Mv i.208.4 (here mss. °hyāna) = ii.12.13
Caus. *vijahayati: Ger. vijahayya Bhīk 15a.5 (§ 38.9)
(2) *hāya-te, -ti* = Pali id.; irregular passive (§ 37.38)
Pres. hāyate Mv i.147.1, 5 etc.; parihāyante Gv 462.9; opt. parihāye Mv ii.204.14
Fut. hāyiṣyati Mv i.44.4; °yanti Mv i.241.18
Aor. parihāyiṣū SP 170.2
(3) Caus. *hāpaya-ti* (Skt.)
Pres. impv. parihāpehi Mv iii.168.1
(4) Miscellaneous forms
Pres. in caus. mg. (§ 38.24) jahāti SP 61.8
Fut. prahāsate Ud xix.1 (§ 31.27)
Inf. prahātavai (intending °ve?) Ud xxxi.2 (§ 36.14)

hiṃsa-ti, injure, also *hiṃsaya-ti*, id. (both Skt.)
Pres. opt. hiṃsi (2 sg.) Mv ii.236.6; vihiṃsaye (3 sg.) Mv iii.322.10; vihiṃsevā Mv ii.10.20
Aor. vihiṃsi (3 pl.) LV 75.16; hiṃsiṣu LV 28.6; vihiṃse Mv iii.369.10

hiṇḍ-, wander: (1) (chiefly with *ā-, anvā-*)*hiṇḍa-ti, -te*, MIndic = Pali (ā-, anvā-)hiṇḍati; also *hiṇḍaya-ti*, non-caus.
Pres. āhiṇḍati Māy 242.31; anvāhiṇḍati Divy 249.11; °anti Mmk 139.19 (so read for aṇḍā hi°); 249.10; °ate Av ii.116.10; āhiṇḍase Divy 165.3; pple. hiṇḍan LV 140.7 (see Dict.); anvāhiṇḍatā (instr.) Divy 237.24; °ḍantā (n. pl.) Mv i.20.3; paryāhiṇḍanto (n. sg. m.) Mv i.353.4; °ḍantiye (gen. sg. fem.) Mv iii.155.1; anvāhiṇḍamāna- Av i.242.6; upāhiṇḍamāna- Divy 264.19
Ger. anvāhiṇḍayitvā Mvy 6942; °hiṇḍya Mvy 5116; LV 16.4; Divy 68.23; 139.3; Av i.5.10
(2) (*ā-, anvā-*)*hiṇḍya-te*, not recorded elsewhere
Pres. anvāhiṇḍyante Divy 175.12, 15; pple. āhiṇḍyamāna- Divy 141.22

hiṣ-, hīṣ-, neigh (cf. Skt. heṣati): (1) *hiṣa-ti*, nowhere recorded
Pres. hiṣati LV 236.7 (vs)
(2) **hīṣa-ti*, nowhere recorded; § 28.36
Ppp. hīṣita- Mv ii.160.7
Ger. hīṣitvā Mv iii.76.2, 12
(3) *hīṣya-ti*, nowhere recorded
Pres. hīṣyanti (v.l. hreṣyanti, cf. Skt. hreṣati) Mv i.308.6

hu-, pour: (1) *juho-ti, juhu-mas* (Skt.)
Ger. juhutvā (on weak pres. stem) Mv iii.426.18 (§ 35.14)
(2) *juhva-ti*, 3 sg. (§ 28.11)
Pres. juhvati Mv iii.426.12 (prose; so one ms., v.l. junati which is obviously corrupt; certainly 3 sg.)
(3) **juha-ti*; § 28.18
Fut. juhiṣyāmaḥ Mv iii.161.11
Ppp. juhita- Mv iii.149.2; 431.14 = 17 = 445.7, 10
Inf. juhanāya Mv iii.161.9

huduhuduya-ti, onomat. (of nāgas sending rain); cf. huḍuk, huluhulī
Pres. impv. °yantu Megh 304.18

hū-, call: (1) *hvaya-ti* (Skt.)
Caus. āhvāpayate (§ 38.55) Divy 323.1; Ger. āhvāpya Av ii.53.5
(2) *hvāya-ti*, nowhere recorded; § 28.33; Senart compares bhāyati from bhī. The ā is probably due to influence from nominal forms, cf. Pali ppp. avhāta for Skt. āhūta
Pres. āhvāyanti Mv i.177.6 (vs, but metrically indifferent in 2d syllable)
(3) *hūya-ti*, cf. Skt. āhūyate, passive only
Pres. āhūyati, calls upon, challenges, Divy 275.9 (prose), § 37.23

hṛ-, take: (1) *hara-ti* (Skt.), also *hare-ti*, non-caus. (§ 38.21)
Pres. āhareti Mv iii.201.5; opt. abhinirhari (1 sg.) Bhad 34; udāhare (2 sg.) Mv i.77.6; hareyā Mv ii.146.13
Aor. uddharī (§ 32.121; 2 sg.) LV 195.12; nirhari (1 sg.) Bhad 6[2]; udāhariṣu LV 413.21; uddharetsuḥ Mv iii.78.18; viharesi (3 sg.) Mv i.228.4, 6, 10; abhinirharesi Mv i.228.12; āharesi Mv ii.233.8; 234.9; āhare Mv i.343.6, 16; āharema (1 pl.) Mv i.344.15 (§ 32.105)
Ppp. vyavaharita- Mv i.271.18; vyāharita- Divy 397.24
Ger. haritvā Mv ii.93.6; saṃharitvāna Mv i.304.15; uddharetvā (§ 35.26) Mv i.7.14; vihariya LV 243.11
Inf. viharitum Mv i.34.13; pratisaṃharaṇāya Mv iii.252.8; viharatum (§ 36.7) Divy 498.3
Gdve. viharitavya- Mv iii.265.11
Caus. harāpayasi MSV iv.207.2
(2) *-hāra-ti, -te*, prob. denom.; § 28.33. Recorded only once in Pali; see below, and under (4)
Pres. pple. saṃvyavahāramāṇa- Divy 259.10 (prose); Dict.; same form in Pali saṃvohāramāna- AN ii.188.10; saṃvohāra occurs in the same Pali context (but saṃvyavahāra not in the Divy context)
(3) *-haro-ti*; § 28.18
Pres. abhyuddharoti Dbh.g. 21(357).12. No v.l. reported; perhaps read °dhareti (cf. above under 1). But Kondo's ed. also has °dharoti.

(4) Caus. *hāraya-ti* (Skt.). On *saṃhārayati*, prob. not belonging here, see s.v.
[Aor. āhāretsu(ḥ) Mv i.340.8, 9; in 9 v.l. āhar°; object āhāram; prob. denom., cf. (2)]
Pass. impv. ohārīyatu Mv i.295.18
(5) Miscellaneous forms (on hrīyati, °te, see s.v. hrī 2)
Aor. harṣur (3 pl.) LV 271.16 (§ 32.74)
Ger. -hārakaṁ Mv i.343.4; -hāriṃ Mv ii.65.10 etc. (§§ 35.5, 6)

hṛṣ-, thrill: (1) **harṣa-ti*; cf. Ved. harṣata, Skt. once saṃharṣamāṇa- (MārkP., see BR); Pali haṃsati and perhaps hassati (see PTSD s.v. hasati), both derivable from Skt. hṛṣyati; is harṣati a false Sktization of one of these MIndic forms? § 28.40
Aor. harṣī LV 232.16
(2) Caus. *harṣaya-ti* (Skt.)
Aor. saṃpraharṣaye (v.l. °yet) Mv i.334.1
Ger. harṣitva SP 25.7

heṭhaya-ti, heṭhe-ti, rarely *heṭha-ti*, injure; MIndic: Pali heṭheti, heṭhayati. In large measure takes the place of hiṃs-
Pres. viheṭhāma Mv iii.131.19; heṭheti Mv iii.215.14; viheṭhayati Dbh 91.1; °yasi Divy 42.17; °yanti LV 76.18; opt. viheṭhayeta LV 338.10; °yet LV 403.7; viheṭheya Mv ii.178.7; °ṭhaye Mv iii.322.16, 19; pple. a-viheṭhayatā Divy 104.13; 105.19
Fut. viheṭhayiṣyanti LV 404.11; °ṣyati Mv i.361.16
Aor. viheṭhi (3 pl.) LV 75.16; viheṭhetsuḥ Mv iii.359.19
Ppp. viheṭhita- Mv ii.225.17
Ger. heṭhayitvā Mv iii.369.8
Gdve. viheṭhayitavya- Mv i.360.11

hrī-, be ashamed: (1) *hriyāya-ti, hrīy°*(?), denom.(?); cf. Pali hirīyati, hiriyati, harāyati (is our form a blend of these?); Pkt. hiriāmi
Pres. pple. fem. hriyāyantī (in 8 v.l. hrī°) Mv ii.48.8, 11; hrīyāyantī (so text, but v.l. hriyayāyantī, intending hriyāyantī) Mv ii.64.5
Caus. hriyāpayanti Bhīk 11a.5; § 38.56
(2) *hrīya-ti, -te* Mv ii.365.13; 366.6, 10. If from this root, cf. Pali hirīyati (above). But context suggests that passive forms of hṛ may be meant: 'is carried away' = Skt. hriyate, with ī perhaps m.c.; cf. Pali harīyati (to harati). There are dependent instrumentals doṣeṇa, rāgeṇa, etc. Cf. § 28.25
(3) *jihrīya-ti*: blend of Skt. jihreti and Pali hirīyati? § 28.25
Pres. jihrīyati, v.l. for jihreti Karmav 47.26; in 49.2 text jihrīyati without support of mss., one of which reads hriyati, the other omits; in 49.10, 16 text with mss. jihrīyati (v.l. in 16 °te)
Ger. jihrīya MSV i.14.16 (but this is doubtless based on the Skt. weak pres. stem jihrī-, § 35.14)
(4) Intens. *jehrīya-te*: recorded nowhere else, not even in Pali
Pres. °yate Mvy 1829; °yante Divy 39.7; pple. °yamāṇa- SP 108.6
(5) Miscellaneous
Gdve. hretavya- Bbh 223.9 (§ 34.21)